

Q900. c. 101. 77

THE

~~Acc. c. 87. 77~~

~~16. 6. 173~~

ECLECTIC REVIEW

~~18. 3. 77~~

MDCCCXLIII.

JANUARY — JUNE.

Φιλοσοφίαν δὲ οὐ τὴν Στωικὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικουρεῖον
τε καὶ Ἀριστοτελικὴν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἐκάστη τῶν αἵρεσέων τούτων
καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς ἐπιστήμης ἐκδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σύμπαν το
'ΕΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΟΝ φιλοσοφίαν φῆμι. — CLEM. ALEX. Strom. L. 1.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XIII.

LONDON:

THOMAS WARD & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

W. OLIPHANT AND SON, EDINBURGH;

JAMES MACLEHOSE, GLASGOW.

1843.



Academia Cantabrigiensiſ
Lib.

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR JANUARY, 1843.

- Art. I. 1. *An Apology for the Lollard Doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Now first printed from a Manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. With an Introduction and Notes*, by James Henthorn Todd, D.D., V.P.R.I.A., Fellow of Trinity College, and Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. London: printed for the Camden Society. 1842. Introduction, pp. lxiii; pp. 206.
2. *The Last Age of the Church.* By John Wycliffe. Now first printed from a Manuscript in the University Library, Dublin. Edited with Notes, by James Henthorn Todd, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral. Dublin: at the University Press. 1840.
3. *Diatribæ in Johannis Wicliffi, Reformationis Prodrömi, Vitæ, Ingenium, Scripæ.* Auctore, S.A.J. De Ruever Groneman, Theol. Doct. Trajecti ad Rhenum, apud Rob. Natan. 1837. 8vo. pp. 283.

ARCHBISHOP USSHER was a great collector of manuscripts, and among his liberal contributions to the library of Trinity College, Dublin, are several volumes of Wycliffe manuscripts. In one of those volumes is this exposition and defence of Lollardism, now first printed, and edited by Dr. Todd. The volume 'is in vellum, containing two hundred and nineteen leaves, each $6\frac{2}{4}$ inches by $4\frac{2}{3}$, a full page having thirty-one or thirty-two lines, very neatly and accurately written, in the usual secretary hand of the fourteenth, or the beginning of the fifteenth century; the last leaf is wormed, and the volume ends imperfectly.' The manuscripts in this volume are by no means the most valuable in the collection of Wycliffe's writings preserved in Trinity College, and the pieces included in it vary in extent as much as in interest, the treatise now printed consisting of more than eighty

pages, while several others do not exceed a single page, or a single leaf. Altogether, they number twenty-nine pieces, of which Dr. Todd has given the titles so far as it was practicable to do so.

But concluding his description of the tract numbered XXIII., Dr. Todd says—

‘All the foregoing treatises, from No. XVI. to this inclusive, appear to have been omitted in the lists of Wycliffe’s writings.’

The treatises thus referred to are described as follows:—

‘XVI. Of Antechristis song in chirche. XVII. Of Praier a tretys. XVIII. Nota de Confessione. XIX. A tract without title, beginning, ‘Crist forsoothe did all that he couthe to obeye lordis, and mekely and softly speke to hem.’ XX. A tract entitled, ‘Nota de sacramento altaris.’ This title has been blotted with ink by a modern hand, so, however, that the words are still legible. XXI. A tract without title, beginning, ‘Crisostom seith, that fischers and buystouse men, makyinge iche daye nettis,’ &c. XXII. Another tract without title, beginning, ‘Seynt Barnard spekith thus: Eugenye the Pope,’ &c. XXIII. A tract without title, beginning, ‘God moueth hooly chirche bi many manner of spechis to knowe the truethe of this lawe,’ &c.

Dr. Vaughan’s account of the volume to which these notices relate, is as follows:—

‘Another volume in the same library contains a MS. intituled, ‘Of apostasy and the possessions of clerks.’ The volume further contains the following tracts:—*Of Pseudo Friars. Of the eight woes which God wished to Friars. Of Antichrist and his ways. Of Antichrist’s Song in the Church. A Treatise of Prayer. A Treatise on Confession. A Tract of Christian obedience*, beginning, ‘Christ forsooth did all that he could to obey lords.’ In the volume there are several separate homilies, meditations on various subjects, and a short treatise beginning, ‘How are questions and answers put that are written hereafter.’ The collection forms a duodecimo volume of about four hundred pages, written with a very small, but legible character. Class C., Tab. 5, No. 6.*

It will be seen by comparing the above extracts, that of the eight pieces described by Dr. Todd as hitherto ‘omitted in the lists of Wycliffe’s writings,’ four have been described, and with their proper titles, by Dr. Vaughan; of the other four, there are three which have no titles, but which, from Dr. Todd’s own list, appear to have been in the main justly described by Dr. Vaughan as ‘separate homilies and meditations’—the first consisting of one leaf, the second of five, and the last of two; and with regard to

* Life and Opinions of Wycliffe. Vol. II., p. 392. Second Edition.

the one remaining piece, we may suppose that Dr. Todd has been more fortunate than Dr. Vaughan in being able to decipher a title which 'some modern hand has endeavoured to blot out.'

It is plain, then, that Dr. Todd has put forth a statement in this case, in respect to a matter of fact, which proves to be the contrary of fact. How are we to account for this? Is it to be ascribed to ignorance? Not to ignorance assuredly. Dr. Todd is a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; he is a person whose tastes dispose him to black letter studies; and during the last seven years, the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin have been an object of particular attention with him. The result has been a series of papers, which have appeared from time to time in the 'British Magazine,' in which the writer has appeared to find his great and constant pleasure in endeavouring to depreciate the ill-paid labours, and hardly earned reputation of Dr. Vaughan, as author of 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe.' One of these papers relates to the contents of this very volume, and the burden of it is a censure of Dr. Vaughan, either on account of what he has said concerning the volume, or on account of what he has failed to say concerning it.

Ignorance, therefore, is out of the question. Shall we, then, say that Dr. Todd has put forth a statement as being fact, which he must have known at the time to have been the contrary of fact? That would be a grave charge to prefer against the fellow of a college, the treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and the vice-president of the Irish Antiquarian Society. But we request our readers to look to what is now before them, and they have our free consent to devise escape for Dr. Todd from that heavy reproach, if they can. We can only say that we have read the above passages again and again, to see how such a conclusion may be avoided, and how to avoid it we find not.

We at first thought it possible that this manifest misrepresentation might have resulted from some oversight or forgetfulness. But on looking further into the matter, we do not see how that plea can be for a moment admitted, inasmuch as the introduction now printed along with this Lollard treatise, contains a reference to the paper in the 'British Magazine,' in which Dr. Todd had given his account of the volume of MSS. from which this treatise has been selected, and in that account Dr. Todd has transcribed and printed the above extract from Dr. Vaughan's book, and that for the purpose of indulging in his usual strain of comment upon it! It will appear also, presently, that this is not the only instance in which Dr. Todd's prejudices have prompted him to put forth statements of this strange description.

Concerning the publication before us, we are of opinion that

this manuscript ought not to have been attributed to the pen of Wycliffe. Our reasons are the following:—

I. Dr. Todd remarks concerning it, 'that it appears, from several expressions, to have been delivered to an assembly of judges, before whom the author was called upon to defend his opinions.' Supposing this to be so, we are at a loss to perceive on what occasion in the life of Wycliffe, he would have been likely to have prepared such a paper. The occasions on which his opinions came under the notice of 'an assembly of judges,' were in 1377 and 1378, and again in 1381 and 1382. In 1377 he appeared before the convocation in London, in company with the Duke of Lancaster and Earl Percy. Six months later he appeared again before the clergy at Lambeth. But the paper prepared in exposition and defence of his opinions at that time, was prepared in Latin, was delivered to his judges, and has been preserved. We hear nothing of any other paper of the same description as produced at that juncture; nor is it probable that any paper supplied by the reformer at that period would have exhibited the matured system of Lollardism presented in the document now edited by Dr. Todd. In 1381, the authorities in Oxford censured the doctrine of Wycliffe, but their censure was confined to the doctrine of the eucharist, and the judgment passed on the reformer's doctrines in the clerical assembly convened in the Grey Friars' Church in London, in the following year, was simply a judgment upon certain opinions, in order to the instituting of proceedings against the persons who should be suspected of holding them. Neither Wycliffe, nor any other supposed delinquent, was cited to appear before the authorities who then acted as judges.

But this difficulty of seeing on what occasion Wycliffe was likely to have prepared an extended and elaborate document of this kind, would not, we confess, be an insuperable difficulty with us did it stand alone, but taken with other circumstances, it has considerable weight in our judgment.

II. Our next objection to the notion that this document is from the pen of Wycliffe, is grounded on the complexion of the document itself. Dr. Todd speaks of the 'moderation of its tone,' as being a feature of the treatise favourable to his notion of its being a work of the reformer. But in this dispassionateness, observable as it is, with so little exception, through so long a document, we see strong evidence on the side of an opposite conclusion. From this cause the work is found to be singularly devoid of all reference to contemporary character and circumstances. If written by Wycliffe, it must have been written, as Dr. Todd elsewhere intimates, toward the close of the reformer's history,—

sometime, we should say, within the last seven years of his life, and those years were all passed amidst great change, incessant labour, and much excitement. Almost everything written by the reformer at that period bears this impress from the times, and from his own feelings as affected by passing events. Hence his English pieces, which were mostly written during that interval, contain frequent references to recent or passing occurrences, by means of which, it has been found possible to determine the dates of much the greater part of them.* The schism in the papacy, which began in 1378; the crusade on that account which took place in 1383; the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular tongue, and the controversy which it called forth from about 1381; the insurrection of the commons during that year; the controversy raised from about that time by Wycliffe's novel opinions concerning the eucharist, and by the conduct of his missionary, or 'preaching priests,' and the various proceedings publicly instituted against his doctrine and followers. These are the sort of contemporary facts to which allusion is made, and made so frequently and passionately in the writings of Wycliffe belonging to the period adverted to, that no mind of any sagacity, we should have thought, could have passed from the perusal of those pieces, to a careful examination of the document now printed, without being conscious of the marked want of these characteristics. Wycliffe wrote nothing in English half so extended, the date of which it has not been easy to ascertain; nor has he anywhere treated the same topics, in anything like the same extent, without more frequent and powerful outbreaks of feeling.

III. Our third objection to the assumed authorship of this manuscript, has respect to the language or dialect in which it has been written. On this point, Dr. Todd remarks:—

'There is another source of internal evidence from which it is possible that some light might be thrown upon this question—at least, so far as indicating the shire or province in which the author lived. This, however, is a subject which the editor, being an Irishman, is necessarily incompetent to investigate; and he has therefore thought it safer to leave the discussion of it to others, than to undertake it, entering upon it with such imperfect information as he might perhaps have gleaned from books. He felt also that the attempt to fix the locality of an author of the fourteenth century, from the provincial idioms to be found in his writings, must in every case be somewhat precarious, unless we can be supposed to have fully satisfied ourselves that the phrases which are now found to characterize a particular shire, were all peculiar to that shire five centuries ago.'

* Life and Opinions of Wycliffe, vol. i., Note, pp. 381, 382, *et alibi*. Second edition.

This passage is characteristic of Dr. Todd's mind; it exhibits some appearance of acumen, but the acumen fails to reach its proper object. The question is not whether the dialect of the north of England now, was its dialect four centuries ago; nor whether the dialect of the north of England then, was not also the dialect of the south,—though even an Irishman might have been able, with no great difficulty, to make some way toward the solution of these questions; but the point in the present case is,—are there differences of dialect, differences such as to bespeak a *distinct authorship, between the most accredited works of the reformer, and the treatise now attributed to him?* On this point Dr. Todd might have found materials for a judgment without quitting the sister island, and even without passing beyond the walls of Trinity College, Dublin. The following terms, as terms of dialect, occur uniformly in this treatise:—‘swilk’ for ‘such;’ ‘wilk’ for ‘which;’ ‘tan,’ or ‘tane,’ for ‘taken;’ ‘ilk’ for ‘same;’ ‘ken’ for ‘teach,’ or ‘know;’ ‘mikil’ for ‘much;’ ‘kirk’ for ‘church.’ It were easy to extend this list. But in all these instances, where the author of the treatise uses the former terms, Wycliffe, in his translation of the New Testament, and in his writings generally, uses the latter terms. There may be some exceptions to this rule, but such is the rule distinguishing the dialect of the treatise from the language of Wycliffe's acknowledged works; and concerning the more marked of the above terms, we may venture to say, that while they occur constantly in the treatise, they never occur in the genuine writings of the reformer. Thus the term ‘kirk’ occurs in *all* cases in the treatise, excepting one, where it appears as part of a quotation. But in Wycliffe's New Testament that term *never* occurs, and it will not be found, we think, in his writings. The same may be said of many similar terms.

IV. But our strongest ground of objection to the assumption that Wycliffe was the author of this treatise, relates to portions of the matter contained in the work. Dr. Todd says, ‘the treatise contains nothing inconsistent with the supposition that Wycliffe was its author.’ But we feel obliged to demur to this conclusion. On the doctrine of the eucharist the author of the treatise expresses himself thus:—

‘This is that we say, and in all manner strive to prove, the sacrifice of the kirk to stand together in two things, and to be made in two things together; that is, the visible species of elements, and the invisible flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; sacrament and thing of the sacrament,—that is, the body of Christ; as the person of Christ standeth together of God and man, for he is very God and man; for ilk thing containeth in itself the nature of those things that it is made of; this thing that is seen is bread, and the cup that the eyes schewen;

but this that the faith asketh to be informed the bread is the body of Christ. Also the decree saith, I, Beringary, consent to the holy kirk of Rome, and as the apostle saith, I acknowledge from the mouth and heart, me to hold the same faith of the sacrament of the Lord's board, the worshipful Sir Nicol, pope in his holy synod, he hath be tane me of authority of the gospel, and of the apostle, and hath fermed to me the *bread and wine* that are put in the altar, to be after the consecration, *not only sacrament, but very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ sensibly, not only in sacrament, but in truth to be treated, with hands of the priest to be broken, and with the teeth of faithful men.*—pp. 47, 48.

In this passage we have not retained all the old orthography, and the parts in italics we have so marked. Dr. Todd refers to the passage as a denial of transubstantiation, but as the assertion of a real presence. It would, however, we suspect, greatly perplex any man to distinguish between this alleged assertion of nothing more than a real presence, and an assertion of the doctrine of transubstantiation itself; and though Wycliffe refers to the famous canon, *Ego Berengarius*, as though in some way favourable to his doctrine, his reference to it is obscure, he does not cite the canon, and does not adopt its language as *expressive of his own faith*, as is done by the author of this treatise.

Our persuasion is, that Wycliffe's reference to the canon, *Ego Berengarius*, both in his *Triologus*, and in one other connexion, should be interpreted as an appeal to it, not as expressing his own opinion, but as being an act of the church which marked the time of her departure from the ancient faith on that subject, the time which he describes as that of the loosing of Satan after the restraint of a thousand years. Dr. Todd describes the passage as 'in full agreement with the doctrine maintained by Wycliffe in the *Triologus*, lib. c. 2, seq.' Since this statement came under our notice, we have again read the nine chapters in the fourth book of the *Triologus*, which relate to this subject, and the result is a conviction that the statement of Dr. Todd is not correct. Wycliffe concludes the discussion of this topic in his fourth chapter with these words:—'It is manifest from the aforesaid conclusions that this venerable sacrament is in its own nature true bread, and sacramentally the body of Christ.*' It is true, he speaks of the sacrament which he describes as being 'naturally very bread,' as being 'sacramentally and truly the body of Christ.' But he is careful to reiterate that by 'truly,' in this connexion, is meant a true 'sign' or 'figure,' as John was the figure of Elias, and as the rock of the wilderness was a figure of Christ. It is even said that the bread, as used in this sacrament, is 'exalted to a

* 'Et patet fidelitas conclusionis prædicta, quod hoc sacramentum venerabile est in natura sua verus panis, et sacramentaliter corpus Christi.'

more worthy substance ;' but it is affirmed, in the same sentence, that the nature of the bread is not changed by its being put to this high and sacred use. The doctrine of the 'identification' or 'impanation' of the body of Christ with the bread, he declares to be 'impossible and heretical,' denouncing it as fraught with the 'most detestable idolatry,' and as a notion which would degrade the Divinity to a level with 'the basest things in the world.' In the last chapter, on the question, 'Whether two bodies may be in the same place?' he speaks of some as understanding 'that the body of Christ is in the host corporally, substantially, and essentially.' This he denies altogether, alleging that the body of Christ is there 'spiritually, and in a manner, essentially distinguished from the substance of the bread.'*

It must be obvious, we think, that this is a very different thing from saying, as Dr. Todd's representation would lead the uninitiated to suppose was the manner of Wycliffe, that the bread and wine become after the consecration, '*not only a sacrament, but the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,*' that those substances become this '*sensibly ;*' not only sacramentally, 'but in truth,' the bread being '*that very body which is broken by the hands of the priest, and with the teeth of the faithful.*' If Wycliffe's ideas concerning the presence of Christ in the eucharist differed at all from those now generally entertained among protestants, it was in so slight a degree as scarcely to admit of being defined. It is certain, that when writing the fourth book of his *Triologus*, he held no such doctrine on this subject as is expressed in the language imputed to him by Dr. Todd; and if this treatise could be ascribed to Wycliffe, it must have been written by him about the same time with the *Triologus*.

But strong as this point may be, it is by no means the strongest opposed to the statement of Dr. Todd, that 'the treatise contains nothing inconsistent with the supposition that Wycliffe was the author.' The second chapter of the treatise is upon indulgences, and contains the following passage:—

'It seemeth well that popes, cardinals, and other prelates, priests, and other religious, may medefully and graciously sell indulgences and merits of saints, and prayers, and ghostly suffrages, as they may grant by Christian men swilk (such) things, or benefits and deeds of mercy and other goods; and thus may the other buy. And many may not take part of grace nor of bliss, but if they buy it in some manner, and it be sold them, it seemeth by this that Christ bought us again, and for our good deeds promises us heavenly kingdom ; thus blessed martyrs for glorious martyrdoms deserved to have perpetual crowns. Thus the apostle did all things for the gospel, that he should be made pre-

* '*Corpus Christi est ibi spiritualiter, etiam modo quo distinguitur essentialiter a corpore panis.*'

server thereof. Also thus say we, oh, marvellous merchandize, the Maker of mankind taking a solid body of the Virgin, deigned to be borne, and foregoing man without seed, may give us his godhead; such faith is ever made in hope, trust, and charity. And thus if the pope, or any other, any time faithfully and charitably grant and promise to any man *indulgence, or part of merit of saints, part of prayers, abstinence, wakings, obedience, or other deeds*, justly, and on God's pleasure, and graciously, for their good deeds, either that they be released of sins, or of pains, or that they be the more stirred to the faith, or to please God, *blessedly they sell* swilk (such) things to them. But if the pope, led by covetousness, or otherwise, as by simony, or with the spirit of pride, as if they herewith beginning disposed all things, and grant swilk (such) things to ilke man, yea, without merit, or without God leader before. . . . who shall then doubt but that the pope and others sell such things sinfully?*

It will be seen that in this passage we have a full recognition of the popish bank of merit. The merits of martyrs and saints, their prayers, abstinence, vigils, obedience, and deeds, all are regarded as available as means of release from sins and pains in the case of those who need such assistance. This supposed accumulation of saint and martyr merit is to be dispensed virtuously and religiously, but it is supposed to exist, and the clergy are set forth as the proper almoners of this sort of bounty. Is this the doctrine of Wycliffe? We think not.

In the work 'On Prelates,' which was written by the Reformer, in common with the last book of the Trialogus, not more than two years before his death, he expresses himself as follows, on this subject:—'But the simony of the court of Rome does most harm, for it is most common, and done most under the colour of holiness, and robbeth most our land. When a lord hath the gold for his presentation, the gold dwelleth still in the land, but when the pope hath the first fruits, the gold goeth out, and cometh never again. *And so for pardons; if they are aught worthy they must be free, and to take money for them is to sell God's grace, and so simony.*'† In the thirteenth chapter of the same treatise, this doctrine is condemned still more explicitly. The clergy, it is said, are wont to promise pardon, 'by virtue of Christ's passion, and of the martyrdom and holy merits of saints, which they did more than was needful for their own bliss, *but this Christ taught never in all the gospel, and never used it, neither Peter nor Paul. Marvellous it is that any sinful fool dares grant anything on the merit of saints, for all that ever any saint did may not bring a soul to heaven without the grace and might of Christ's passion.*' In this alone, it is alleged, are 'all merits which are

* Pp. 10, 11. † MS., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, chap. iv.

needful:' and the same doctrine occurs in many other places. This, it will be seen, is not quite the same thing with setting forth the popish doctrine concerning the supererogatory merit of saints as a truth, and then describing the indulgences drawn from the treasury of those merits as the matters of a legitimate spiritual 'merchandize,' which men, under certain regulations, may 'blessedly sell, and blessedly buy.'

But such was the doctrine of Wycliffe, and such is the doctrine of a treatise described by Dr. Todd as containing 'nothing inconsistent with the supposition that Wycliffe was its author'!

It may be alleged as some extenuation of this palpable error, that the evidence showing it to be such, is derived from manuscripts, and from manuscripts difficult to consult, and little known; and in the case of most men this plea might have been admitted. But in the case of Dr. Todd it is not admissible. Dr. Todd is much praised by some of his clerical friends, on account of the supposed accuracy and extent of his knowledge on this subject. They speak of him as more competent than any other man to the sort of work which he has undertaken in the publication of this treatise; and the manner in which Dr. Todd has taken upon himself the office of censor in regard to those who have ventured to meddle with such matters, has been such as to indicate sufficiently that he does not account the praise so bestowed as being ill-placed. The least that may be exacted from Dr. Todd is, that he should show himself to be very familiar with what is contained in the Wycliffe MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin. The manner in which Dr. Todd has written concerning those MSS., and the ease with which he may have consulted them at any time, during many years past, render it imperative to his reputation that he should not allow himself to be convicted of any material mistake concerning them. But in that collection are copies of all the more valuable of the Reformer's works, and among them a copy of the very treatise 'On Prelates,' from which the above extracts are taken. Our extracts were made from the copy in Cambridge, but we doubt not that the copy in Dublin will be found to contain them; and were the copy existing in Dublin imperfect, or wholly wanting, the remaining MSS. in that collection, contain matter, the smallest acquaintance with which should have sufficed to have saved Dr. Todd from so egregious an error as is that into which he has fallen on this point.

But we have now to add, that our proofs in respect to the unsoundness of Dr. Todd's pretensions with regard to a peculiarly accurate acquaintance with the writings of Wycliffe, are not derived wholly from manuscript sources. The fourth book of the *Dialogus* contains a noble summary of the reformer's

opinions; it includes evidence of being written within two years of his death; and his opponents, Wodeford, Walden, and the good fathers at the council of Constance, have taken care that we should not be left in any uncertainty as to whether the *Triologus* should be accounted a genuine work of Wycliffe or not. Now this *Triologus* is a printed book, a book which Dr. Todd cites, and which, in consequence, we must suppose him to be in circumstances to consult. We have had reason to complain of Dr. Todd as having made a very sorry use of this book when professing to state to his readers the doctrine of Wycliffe on the matter of the eucharist. But we have stronger ground of complaint in the present instance.

The fourth book of the *Triologus* is divided, like the rest, into chapters, each chapter has its heading, and one of these headings is *De Indulgentiis*. It might have been supposed that the most superficial inquirer concerning matters of this sort, could hardly have observed the manner in which the doctrine of indulgences is set forth in the treatise now printed, without a very strong misgiving as to the propriety of attributing such a document to Wycliffe; and however natural it might be that obscure manuscripts, difficult to consult, should have been somewhat overlooked, the least to have been expected was, that the doctrine of the reformer on this subject, as stated in the printed and more accessible portions of his works, should have been carefully examined. But strange to say, in the present case, even this obvious source of information appears to have been wholly neglected. In the chapter of the *Triologus*, *De Indulgentiis*, the reformer thus states the received doctrine on this subject:—‘In the first place, they suppose that infinite supererogatory merits of saints are laid up in heaven, and especially the merit of the Lord Jesus Christ, enough for the salvation of infinite worlds, and that Christ has appointed the pope as chief over the whole of this treasure; and secondly, that what it pleases him to dispense from that source, he has power to distribute without limit, since the treasure remains infinite. Against this VULGAR BLASPHEMY I have often inveighed.’* He then proceeds to state, at length, on what ground he so judged this doctrine; partly because he regarded it as an assumption of power on the part of the pope, which Christ himself never assumed, either as man or God; partly, because if it were true, it would then be the fault of the pontiff if any

* ‘Supponunt enim primo, quod in cœlis sint infinita sanctorum supererogata merita, et specialiter meritum domini nostri Jesu Christi, quod sufficeret salvare mundos alios infinitos, et super illum totum thesaurum Christus Papam constituit. Ad secundum quod sibi libuerit dispensandum, ideo infinitum potest de illo distribuere, cum hoc remaneat infinitum. Contra istam rudem blasphemiam invexi alias.’

portion of mankind should be lost, since the possession of a power to save after this manner, must imply an obligation to put it into exercise; and partly because such a scheme must overlook the fact, that it not only belongs to Christ to complete the righteousness which justifies the sinner, but to bestow upon the mind of the sinner all the grace and worthiness of which it can possibly be possessed.*

Such, then, are the grounds on which we conclude that this treatise is not from the pen of Wycliffe, and on which we are obliged to come to a conclusion little flattering to the notion of Dr. Todd's singular competency to the province of a judge in relation to such questions. It is somewhat unfortunate, that a gentleman, whose supposed capability to the work of editing Wycliffe MSS. has been so much applauded, should have made his appearance in that character under circumstances so little advantageous. This treatise, it seems, has been published, together with its companion at the head of this article, in order to show the weakness of supposing that anything certain can be known in respect to the opinions of Wycliffe, until Dr. Todd, or some one of equal ability in this department of labour, shall have given to the world a complete edition of the reformer's works. Of course, no doubt can now be entertained with regard to the propriety of at once committing the editorship of the whole of the Wycliffe MSS. to the literary integrity, the accurate learning, and the eminent critical sagacity of Dr. Todd.

With regard to the contents of this treatise, it will be sufficient to say that its chief value consists in its presenting, within the limits of a single document, all the leading points of the Lollard controversy, with the usual arguments in support of them. It alleges, as the topics of so many distinct chapters,—that the pope is not the vicar of Christ; that his holiness may not sell indulgences to souls in purgatory, or to the lost; that church censures should be only for spiritual ends, and are without effect if passed on the righteous man; that Christ was cursed; that the power of the keys belongs to every priest; that every priest is bound to preach; that men who accept the offices of an immoral priest, commit deadly sin; that to curse whom God has not cursed, is to bear false witness against our neighbour; that to choose the poverty of the religious, is to choose damnation; that fasting is

* 'Per deducens ad impossibile declaratur, quod si viator in tempore alienius Papæ damnabitur, ipse Papæ erit reus damnationis, propter hoc quod obmittit ipsum salvare . . . quod virtute passionis Christi homines *quicquid* beatitudinis habuerint mercantur . . . Oportet enim Christum plus facere, tam ex parte sui pro complemento justitiæ, quam ex parte peccantis, quem oportet Christum movere, et dare sibi gratiam ad merendum digne, ut taliter sit adiutus.'

needful only as means of abstaining from sin; that a priest is not bound to canonical hours, except officially; that the substance of the bread dwelleth in the sacrament of the altar; that churches are not to be worshipped; that priests who sing by covenant for money, commit simony; that the pope, cardinals, bishops, &c., are disciples of Antichrist; that every holy man is the true vicar of Christ; that a judge condemning an innocent man, sinneth mortally; that marriage within certain degrees is lawful; that the church, by marrying within a prohibited degree sinneth; that the canon law is contrary to God's law; that no man is Christ's disciple unless he keep Christ's counsel; that each man is bound to do the better (to forego a lesser rule when required by a greater); that the written gospel is not to be worshipped; that the use of charms is unlawful; that the vow of the religious is against the gospel of Christ; that religious men are bound to bodily works; and that it is not lawful for the religious to beg. Such are the topics of thirty chapters; the arguments adduced in defence of them exhibit nothing of novelty, and our limits require that we should proceed to examine the next antiquarian fragment edited by Dr. Todd—'The Last Age of the Church.'

This tract occurs in a volume of tracts and treatises preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the greater part of which are undoubtedly Wycliffe's, and the whole of which, it is reasonable to suppose, were so regarded when the volume was transcribed, which appears to have been in the life-time of the reformer, or soon afterwards. The author of 'The Last Age of the Church,' speaks of the year 1356 as that in which the piece was written, a date many years earlier than can be assigned to any other work supposed to be from the pen of Wycliffe. Dr. Todd has justly remarked, that it is this circumstance alone which gives to the production its value. In itself it is little worthy of the reformer's reputation. It is a mystical exposition of church history, dividing it into four periods, the century in which the writer lived being regarded as a destined period of great tribulation, and the time following being that which would be marked by the coming of Antichrist. Hence the title of the tract.

Dr. Vaughan has given some account of this production, and extracts from it, which Dr. Todd has criticised in his favourite repository, the *British Magazine*, with his usual narrowness and ill-temper. Dr. Vaughan is censured because he has described the author of the tract as following the guidance of the abbot Joachim in his mystical interpretation of the times, but the printed tract shows that there was good reason for this representation; and comparing the tract with Mr. Lewis's description of it, as an attack on 'the covetous exactions of the popes,' and

with Dr. Vaughan's description of it, as relating 'to the general corruption of the ecclesiastical system, arising from simony and other causes,' we are disposed to regard the latter as, on the whole, a more just representation of its purport than the former. It makes no mention of the popes nor of Rome, nor does it contain any reference to them, except as it may be implied in the censure of general abuses which the papacy had sanctioned, and had its interest in upholding. Dr. Vaughan has further presumed to give his extracts from this almost unintelligible document, not strictly in the order in which they occur in the MS., and two or three words he is thought to have understood erroneously or doubtfully, but his censor is obliged to admit that the sense of the passages given remains undisturbed, and that points of the criticism in which he has indulged, relate to matters 'of no great consequence.'* We wish also distinctly to state, in this place, that Dr. Todd's notices of Dr. Vaughan's account of this tract, futile and frivolous as they are, may be taken as a favourable specimen of his critical labours in regard to the account which Dr. Vaughan has given of the Wycliffe MSS. generally, in his 'Life and Opinions' of the reformer. On the whole, Dr. Todd has done nothing towards showing that this tract was written by Wycliffe, nor has he thrown any material light upon it in other respects. It is, in common with the Lollard treatise, an interesting publication, but its interest arises from its full and accurate text, and not from anything particularly instructive in the notes of the editor. It must be felt, we think, as a somewhat unpromising affair, that of two manuscripts, published for the purpose of showing what might be accomplished by employing such men as Dr. Todd in editing the writings of Wycliffe, the one should add nothing really valuable to the amount of our previous knowledge, and the other be given to the world in a manner adapted to lead men into much greater mistakes with regard to the doctrine and character of the reformer than they were likely otherwise to have adopted. Unless the stars should be more propitious to Dr. Todd in his next experiment in this way, we doubt much if his labours will prove to be very productive.

But our great complaint against Dr. Todd does not relate to his want of critical discernment, and still less to his want of a certain kind of ecclesiastical learning, though in both these respects he has been foolishly overrated, but to his contracted and ungenerous temper—a temper which has been so far indulged as to have betrayed him into practices singularly at variance with a proper sense of justice, and a just reverence of truth. Enough has appeared in this article to show that we have not formed this

* British Magazine, viii., 207, 272, 402, 406.

opinion lightly; but its accuracy will be further manifest from what follows. The following passage is from Dr. Todd's preface to 'The Last Age of the Church:—

'The list of Wycliffe's writings published by Bishop Bale, in his work, *Scriptorum Majoris Brytanniæ Catalogus*, has been necessarily made the basis of all that subsequent writers have collected. It has been reprinted with many useful additions, by the learned and indefatigable John Lewis, of whose labours every student must speak with gratitude. Mr. Baber also has done much towards assisting future inquirers, by the very valuable list of the reformer's writings which he has compiled. Here, however, we must stop; Mr. Vaughan's compilation has not added much to our knowledge of the subject, nor can it be commended either for accuracy or learning; and Mr. Le Bas does not profess to do more than follow his predecessors. His humble task, however, has been executed with great elegance and judgment.'

With this characteristic report from Dr. Todd, as to the comparative merit of his predecessors in the labour of endeavouring to make the public acquainted with the writings of Wycliffe, we shall connect another report, on the same subject, from a scholar on the continent. The preface to the 'Treatise on the Life, Character, and Writings of Wycliffe,' placed at the head of this article, reads as follows:—

'Seeing that Wycliffe had great weight and influence, both with the men of his own time, and with posterity, and that the age which produced him is most memorable in English history, I have resolved in the following discourse to investigate his character, the times in which he lived, the works he produced, and what kind of ecclesiastical reformation he had in view. In order, however, that the most important facts might become more obvious, I have detailed a few of those events which took place prior to his lifetime, and have treated of those efforts to effect a reformation of the church which were made on the Continent before his day. As Wycliffe was, without doubt, opposed to the errors of the church, not carried away by a sort of overheated zeal, but under the influence of a matured and rational judgment, and appears to have wished to proceed step by step in its reformation, it is from a consideration of these steps that the division of my subject has arisen. Having thus investigated his life, character, and principal doctrines, I have then spoken at some length of his chief works, and in conclusion summed up the substance of the whole treatise, so as to make evident the opinion which ought to be formed in regard to the objects and labours of Wycliffe.

'As to my authorities, I have availed myself as well of the works of those who were the enemies of Wycliffe as of those authors who held him in highest estimation. Accordingly, I have made especial use of the histories of Henry Knyghton and Thomas Walsingham, the former of whom flourished in the time of Wycliffe, the latter in the

following century. I have consulted beyond these many records of councils, and public enactments, and the works of Bale, Fox, Harpsfield, Wood, Wharton, and others who have written about Wycliffe.* Though I saw that his character and doctrines were to be best elucidated from his own writings, I had no opportunity of examining his MSS., which are preserved in great numbers to this day, when those English writers who have immortalized their countryman, assisted me, and held out an admirable light for my guidance. For what had been commenced by Thomas James in his 'Apology for John Wiclif,' published in the year 1608, and by John Lewis, in his book intitled, 'The History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wiclif, D.D.' London. 1720, has been carried out with much more accuracy, fullness, and labour in our own time by Mr. Robert Vaughan, in his work intitled 'The Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D.D.,' London, second edition, 1831, who has illustrated the life, character, and doctrines of the reformer, with extraordinary success, from the Wycliffe MSS. Principally guided by this work, Mr. Le Bas soon afterwards wrote a shorter life of Wycliffe, adapted not only for the learned, but also for ordinary readers—The Life of John Wiclif, London, 1832. Beside these works, I was enabled to avail myself of Baber's preface to Wiclif's version of the New Testament, which he published in 1810, and of a little work containing certain parts of Wycliffe's MSS. which has lately been published by a religious society in London. So much then for the matter, plan, and authorities of my treatise.'

This book presents, as the above extract will have suggested, a judicious and valuable account of the life, opinions, and writings of the reformer. It is an octavo volume, written in elegant latin; it is based on a scrupulous examination of all printed sources of information on the subject, continental and English, from the earliest to the latest; it is written by a scholar, in the language of scholars, and is meant to have its place in the libraries of the learned in Europe and through the world. Dr. Groneman, in common with Mr. Le Bas, was fully acquainted with all that had been published on this subject before the appearance of Dr. Vaughan's book, and both avow their pleasure, in being able to avail themselves of that work as their principal guide. They concur, accordingly, in giving a marked precedence, in value, to

* 'Nobis autem, ex ipsius viri scriptis ingenium ejus et placita præsertim esse explananda intelligentibus, neque libros ejus MSS., qui magno adhuc asservantur numero, inspiciendi copiâ factâ, succurrerunt et facem egregie prætulerunt auctores illi Anglici, qui popularis sui memoriam immortalitati commendarunt. Quod enim antea maxime Thomas Jamesius, in Apologiâ, quam scripsit 1608 pro Joh. Wicliffio, et Johannes Lewisius, in libro: the Hist. of the Life, and Sufferings of John Wicliffe, D.D., Lond. 1720, inceperant, hoc nostra ætate multo accuratius uberiusque elaboratum est a Roberto Vaughano, in opere: The Life and Opinions of John Wycliffe, D.D. Lond. Ed. 2, 1831, qui e libris Wicliffi MSS., cum vitam ejus et ingenium, tum doctrinam, eximie illustravit.'

the publication in which Dr. Todd would not appear to be capable of recognising the slightest degree of merit. Dr. Todd will perhaps answer,—it may be so, but those authors have not given the attention to the Wycliffe MSS. that I have done, or they would think differently. We would, however, respectfully suggest that it will become Dr. Todd to express himself more cautiously on matters of this nature than has been his wont. We know that he has nibbled and fretted on this subject, through paper after paper in the British Magazine, but that anything really valuable has been discovered by him as the result of his studies among Wycliffe MSS. we have still to learn. *To no fact in the reformer's history, to no article of his creed, has Dr. Todd been able to bring the smallest degree of light.* When disposed to appear very authoritative on this subject, we would beseech him to bear in mind, that the blundering which disfigures the editorship of this Lollard Treatise, is not likely to be forgotten; and to remember also, that the world is not made up of the British Magazine, and that there may accordingly be people in it perverse enough to regard him as a person more likely to lead the way upon a false scent on questions of this nature, than upon a true one.

We are willing to suppose that the term 'compilation' in the above extract, is used by Dr. Todd with reference to the compiled list of the reformer's writings at the end of Dr. Vaughan's work, and not with a reference to the work itself. The term, however, is so employed, that almost every one on reading it will understand it in the latter and larger sense—a sense in which the expression would be iniquitously unjust. We know of no work in the recent history of our literature which has afforded greater proof of being the result of original and laborious research than 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe.' Thus much its author might himself freely assert concerning it, since it would merely be to claim, in his own behalf, that very moderate degree of praise which is considered due to the humble merit of industry.

But the policy of Dr. Todd has been, to understand Dr. Vaughan as claiming to have published a book which left not the smallest thing to be supplied concerning the writings of Wycliffe; and on this assumption, our divine has given himself to the study of the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin, in hope of finding something in Dr. Vaughan's account of those MSS. which might be accounted as an inaccuracy, or something which might be made to appear as a defect, and then, upon such real or imaginary instances, it has been his pleasure to employ himself in founding and iterating the charge of unsound and unauthorized pretension. But did Dr. Vaughan send forth his work as one in which no sort of mistake might be detected, or as one on which no im-

provement might be made? No. His claim simply was, that of having brought to his labour, as a biographer of Wycliffe, a mind more adequately instructed with regard to the writings of the reformer than any of his predecessors; and a mind sufficiently informed in that respect to justify him in the persuasion, that no future investigation would be found materially to disturb the report which he had made concerning the life and opinions of that extraordinary man. Now it is not only true that Dr. Todd has done nothing toward showing that this confidence was ill placed, but we venture to assert that it will not be within his power, nor within the power of any coadjutorship which he may obtain, to present the character of Wycliffe in any other light than that in which it is already presented, nor to show that the opinions attributed to the great reformer have been in any material respect incorrectly attributed to him.* The Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin are between sixty and seventy in number; they include transcripts of all the more valuable of the reformer's writings; Dr. Todd has been in the habit of very frequently consulting them for many years past; and this attention has been given to them for the manifest purpose of eliciting from them, if possible, some new light, such especially as might suffice to depreciate the labours of Dr. Vaughan; and what is the effect? We repeat, just nothing. In short, let any man of discernment read the forty-four chapters which constitute the last book of the *Dialogus*, relating as they do throughout to the distinctive opinions of the reformer, and expressing those opinions as they do in the matured period of the reformer's life, and it must be plain, that so far as the substance of Wycliffe's opinions is concerned, mankind are already in possession of their knowledge. Dr. Todd may gravely assure us that we shall not be in a condition to form any certain judgment on that subject, until labour like his own shall have been expended in editing a complete collection of the reformer's writings; and Dr. Todd may flatter himself that in putting forth such language he is giving evidence of his learning, and of his critical dis-

* Only one attempt, we believe, has been made by Dr. Todd to convict Dr. Vaughan of inaccuracy in his description of Wycliffe's opinions, and that is in the first paper which appeared on this subject in the *British Magazine*. Dr. Vaughan has described Wycliffe as teaching that the people were not obliged to pay tithes to unworthy ministers. Dr. Todd alleges that in the passages cited, the reformer merely meant to say that the people in such case would be *less* guilty than the ministers, and not that any fault would justify the withholding of tithes from ministers. But strange enough, the doctrine of one of the chapters of this Lollard treatise is, that to accept of the offices of an immoral priest, is to commit deadly sin; so that, according to Dr. Todd, Wycliffe would account it a deadly sin to accept the offices of an immoral priest, and at the same time count it a very proper thing to pay tithes to such priests for the performance of such offices! We feel assured that Wycliffe was more mindful of the consistent in such matters, than is the manner of Dr. Todd.

cernment and caution, but to men who know what this ground is fully as well, or very much better than Dr. Todd, his conduct will appear in no other light than as a somewhat amusing display of feebleness and arrogance. No other man, we presume, has examined the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin so largely as Dr. Todd; but the equally authentic MSS. of the same works, as existing in England, have been so examined, so analyzed, and so far printed, or reported upon from the press, and the dates, moreover, of so large a proportion of them, have been so distinctly ascertained from internal evidence, that no editorship on this subject can be expected to add anything considerable to our knowledge, though much might no doubt be supplied as affording a wider, and, in some respects, a more satisfactory range of illustration.

But it must not be forgotten, that the genius of antiquarianism has to do with more important and difficult matters than with the history of orthography, with the precise form or power of obsolete letters, or with the kind of illumination proper to ancient manuscripts, or to early specimens of printing. Concerning things of this nature, the 'mint and cummin' of antiquarianism, Dr. Todd is very studious. But the 'weightier matters,' the acute and comprehensive intellect, which can separate between real evidence and false appearances, however blended together; and the moral qualities, which concede readily and heartily to a precursor in labour his due, being intent only upon truth—in these things the vice-president of the Irish Antiquarian Society is lamentably wanting.

Extended as this article has become, there is one more exhibition of the kind of infirmity we have imputed to Dr. Todd to which we must call the attention of our readers. Dr. Vaughan, in a note to one of the chapters in his *Congregationalism*, referred to a statement in one of the papers of Dr. Todd, as containing, in his judgment, a gross misrepresentation. On seeing this note, Dr. Todd sent an angry sort of reply to the pages of the *British Magazine*. To that communication Dr. Vaughan sent an answer, which appeared in the next number of that publication, and from which we select the following passage:—

'Sir,—A friend has called my attention to a paper in your last number from Dr. Todd relating to myself, on which I must beg permission to offer a word or two of explanation.

'The heading given to my catalogue of the Wycliffe MSS. is as follows:—

“SECTION II. *Including the Wycliffe MSS. extant in England and Ireland. This series contains nearly forty MSS., preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the existence of which has been hitherto unknown to the reformer's biographers.*”

‘ To this statement Dr. Todd now objects—

‘ I. That allowing its meaning to be, that my series of the reformer’s MSS. contains mention of nearly forty duplicate or additional manuscripts, of which no mention had been made by any preceding biographer, the statement in this sense is not correct, the manuscripts so mentioned by me being found upon examination to be not more than half that number.

‘ The Nos. admitted by Dr. Todd as so mentioned by me are, No. 1, and Nos. 3 to 19, inclusive, with the exception of No. 6, making together seventeen; but we still count them as eighteen, as No. 19 contains two distinct treatises, enumerated as such by Mr. Lewis. The other Nos. admitted by Dr. Todd as belonging to this series are, Nos. 28, 30, 34, and 44, which brings my series to twenty-two. Then comes No. 47, under which are classed three volumes of manuscripts, each volume consisting of a number of distinct treatises or tracts, enumerated and described by me in the following manner:—

‘ ‘ 47. In a volume preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, is a series of treatises described as follows:—Class C, Tab. 1, No. 23.

‘ ‘ 1. *Tractatus Evangelii de Sermone Domini in Monte, cum Expositorio Orationis Dominica. Dividitur in tres Libros.*

‘ ‘ 2. *Tractatus de Antichristo, cum Expositorio in xxiii., xxiv., xxv., cap. Matthæi.*

‘ ‘ 3. *Tractatus in Sermonem Domini, quem facerat valedicendo Discipulis suis.*

‘ ‘ 4. *Tractatus de Statu Innocentiæ.*

‘ ‘ 5. *Tractatus de Tempore, in 13 capitulis.*

‘ ‘ 6. *Expositio quorundum locorum Scripturæ.* Titus, ii. cap. Heb. i. cap. et Isaia, xxv. cap. But these are merely parts of his homilies. The volume extends to 400 pages, and, which is peculiar to this collection of Wycliffe MSS., it has a copious index.

‘ ‘ Class C, Tab. I., No. 24.—1. *De Simonia.* 2. *De Apostasia.* 3. *De Blasphemia.* The first piece extends to about forty small folio pages, the second to about half that number; the last consists of about eight pages.

‘ ‘ Another volume in the same library contains a MS. entitled, ‘ *Of Apostacy, and Possessions of Clerks.*’ This volume further contains the following tracts:—*Of Pseudo Friars; Of the Eight Woes God wished to Friars; Of Antichrist and his ways; Of Antichrist’s Song in the Church: A Treatise of Prayer; A Treatise on Confession; A Tract of Christian Obedience*, beginning, ‘ Christ forsooth did all that he could to obey lords.’ In this volume there are several separate homilies, meditations on various subjects, a short treatise, beginning—‘ How are questions and answers put that are written hereafter?’ The collection forms a duodecimo volume of about 400 pages, written with a very small but legible character.—Class C, Tab. V., No. 6.*

* Life and Opinions of Wycliffe, vol. ii. pp. 391, 392, second edition.

‘ In this account it will be perceived that there are at least eighteen distinct MSS. described, which makes my series at least forty. Of this number it is admitted that not more than four are mentioned by Mr. Lewis, leaving ‘nearly forty’ to constitute the series which are mentioned by me as existing in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, but which had not been so mentioned by any preceding biographer.

‘ Now it will be in vain for Dr. Todd to plead that these manuscripts are some of them short, inasmuch as a large portion of them are quite of the average length of Wycliffe’s treatises; and inasmuch, also, as he has himself described Nos. 26 and 29 as in the proper sense MSS., and has given Mr. Lewis credit for referring to them as such, though the first does not contain more than four pages, and the second does not exceed two. It will be observed, also, that the nearly twenty MSS. which are classed and described by me under No. 47, are not even bound in one volume, but in three. And it will now be still further observed, that in order to reduce my alleged series of ‘nearly forty’ MSS. to somewhat less than twenty, Dr. Todd has counted these several volumes, each including a series of treatises or tracts, as ONE Wycliffe manuscript! Let this suffice concerning Dr. Todd’s *new* ground of impeachment against me.

‘ II. But admitting for a moment that the matter is, in this respect, as I have shewn it to be, Dr. Todd represents me as saying, that the very *existence* of those nearly forty MSS. had been hitherto unknown to the reformer’s biographers, and this he insists is not true as regards Mr. Lewis.

‘ Now on what evidence does Dr. Todd found his conclusion in favour of Mr. Lewis’s knowledge in this particular?

‘ In part on the fact that the following four lines on this subject appear in Mr. Lewis’s preface: ‘What account I have had of the MSS. in Ireland, I thankfully acknowledge to have received it from the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Kilmore, and the Rev. Dr. Howard, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.’ Dr. Todd supposes that the ‘*What account,*’ &c., thus acknowledged, must be understood to mean a full account, such an account as would enable Mr. Lewis to ‘mention and describe’ every article of Wycliffe MS. in that library. It will be admitted, perhaps, that this was rather a slight form of acknowledgment for services necessarily involving so much labour, and coming from such quarters. It is a very rare thing, as those who have tried it know, for assistance of that nature to be obtained on so large a scale.

‘ But Dr. Todd will no doubt say that it is not on this circumstance alone that his conclusion is grounded. It is proper, however, that I should remind him, that the manner in which he has spoken of the information so obtained by Mr. Lewis is to the above effect. But there was, it seems, a catalogue of the MSS. in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, printed at Oxford in 1697; and this catalogue, it is supposed, as a matter of course, Mr. Lewis must have seen. It is now twice seven years since my attention was occupied with this subject. At that time, the only catalogue of the MSS. in Trinity College,

Dublin, I found known to Dr. Sadlier, the librarian, or to more than one of the fellows with whom I had conversation, was a volume of MS. catalogue which lay on the library table; and in my subsequent correspondence with Dr. Singer—a senior fellow of the college, and a gentleman of whose liberality and kindness I hope ever to retain a grateful remembrance—reference was more than once made to a person in Dublin, who was employed in preparing that desideratum for the manuscript library—a printed catalogue. Was it unnatural, in such circumstances, that I should have been without suspicion as to the existence of such a catalogue? And informed as I now am that such a book exists, and has existed since 1697, my conviction is unhesitating, that it was never seen nor heard of by Mr. Lewis.

‘Had Mr. Lewis been fully apprised by Bishop Godwin, or Dr. Howard, concerning the number and description of the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin, or had he seen the catalogue to which Dr. Todd refers, the proof of the knowledge thus obtained would surely have presented itself in his catalogue, drawn up as that is, on the plan of giving the fullest information in his power, not only with regard to the *works* of Wycliffe, but with regard to the number of existing Wycliffe MSS. Why describe the two or three MSS. which exist in Dublin, and which exist also elsewhere, as so existing, and not describe the ‘nearly forty’ beside which might have been so described? Why mention a tenth portion of these MSS., and leave the nine-tenths unmentioned; and why, especially, do so, when his plan required that whatever knowledge of this kind he possessed should be put forth?

‘The sum is this. Two friends communicate to Mr. Lewis some account of the MSS. in Dublin; and in 1697 a catalogue of those MSS. was printed in England. On the ground of these facts, Dr. Todd informs us, that he ‘happened to *know*’ that the ‘existence,’ at least of the nearly forty MSS. mentioned by me, must have been known to my predecessor, Mr. Lewis. Dr. Todd has not the slightest degree of proof that the persons who gave Mr. Lewis an account of the four MSS. he does mention, gave him an account also of the ‘nearly forty’ which he does not mention; nor has he any proof that Mr. Lewis ever saw the catalogue printed in 1697. While opposed to this want of evidence in favour of his being thus informed, on the one side, is the existence of something amounting to proof on the other side, in the non-appearance of such information in that chapter of Mr. Lewis’s book where his plan required that it should appear, had it been in his possession.

‘When a writer shews that he can make his way to a conclusion, not merely *without* evidence, but *against* it, there must be something wrong somewhere. It is true, by being thus credulous in favour of the knowledge of Mr. Lewis, Dr. Todd seizes upon ground on which to make charges very unfavourable to the knowledge, and even to the integrity, of Dr. Vaughan. Of course, we must not suppose that this has been the *motive* to such credulity.

‘We now come to Dr. Todd’s original misconstruction of the heading to my catalogue of the Wycliffe MSS.—viz.,

‘ III. That of describing me as meaning to say, that my catalogue contains nearly forty newly-discovered *works* of the reformer, and not merely that number of *duplicate* or *additional manuscripts*.

‘ My language is, that my catalogue ‘ contains nearly forty MSS. preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the existence of which has been hitherto unknown to the reformer’s biographers.’

‘ Now can any of your readers need to be reminded, that the history of ancient MSS. is the history of so many separate transcripts, and that the transcript of a work does not cease to be valuable because it is not the only transcript of that work known to exist?

‘ Again—need I remind your readers, that the fact that Mr. Lewis has ‘ mentioned and described’ certain works of the reformer from transcripts of them, to which he had access, as existing in England, is in itself no evidence of his being acquainted with certain transcripts of those same works as existing in Ireland? Or can it be necessary to caution any man against supposing that the fact that Mr. Lewis has ‘ made use’ of a certain series of MSS. in England, is not, as a matter of fact, really the same thing with his having made use of another series of MSS. of the same description in another kingdom?

‘ But Dr. Todd, it seems, has been incapable of perceiving any one of these distinctions. He has been at great pains, it seems, to look intelligently and impartially at this matter, and, after all, he ‘ could not help’ using an ambiguity of expression, which serves to confound all distinction between the *works* of Wycliffe, and the scattered transcripts of those works; nor could he help seeing in the fact that Mr. Lewis knew and used certain MSS. in England, the evidence that he must have known and have used certain other MSS. of the same description not in England. And then, as the consequence of his inability to see otherwise on these points, Dr. Todd ‘ could not help’ charging me with having put on record a deliberate falsehood—a falsehood which would have been as remarkable for its stupidity as its baseness, since it would have been of that broad and obvious description that could not possibly escape detection and exposure!

‘ By this time, perhaps, some of your readers may begin to perceive that there may possibly be other reasons beside such as have respect to the learning or the sagacity of Dr. Todd, which may indispose a man to be much concerned with him as a controvertist.’

Dr. Todd, in the warmth of his indignation, had challenged Dr. Vaughan to a reply. The editor of the *British Magazine*, in consequence, could hardly have refused admission to the above paper; but we were a little curious to see how Dr. Todd would attempt to extricate himself from the unenviable position in which this paper had placed him. When a man stands convicted of delinquencies of this nature, there are two methods of proceeding open to him—a frank confession of his errors, or an attempt to get up the show of a reply, great care being taken, while so doing, to evade the main points of the accusation, and to indulge in disputatious talk about small matters, little, if at all, affecting those points, imposing upon the superficial, by putting forth the sem-

blance of a reply in place of the reality. The latter course is that chosen by Dr. Todd.

The first charge against Dr. Todd is, that in order to reduce the 'nearly forty MSS.,' mentioned by Dr. Vaughan as existing in Dublin, to not more than half that number, Dr. Todd had counted three volumes of MSS., each volume containing a series of tracts or treatises, as one Wycliffe manuscript. The whole of Dr. Todd's reply to this charge is in the following passage:—

'Dr. Vaughan now replies, that by the term 'MSS.' he intended not separate volumes, but tracts or pieces, of which several are generally to be found in the same volume; and, in this way, including some tracts which, although separately enumerated, are, in reality, only chapters or sections of one and the same treatise, Dr. Vaughan has succeeded in showing that he had mentioned about thirty-two MSS., a number which he thinks may be taken as 'nearly forty,' though other people might imagine it nearer to thirty MSS.'

In this short passage there are nearly as many incorrect statements, either direct or virtual, as there are lines. In the first place, it is not, as the above extract insinuates, *one* volume, consisting of a series of treatises or tracts, which Dr. Todd has described as one manuscript, but they are three volumes, which have been so described by him—described, not even as counting for three manuscripts, but as counting for one only! In the second place, it was not reasonable, as Dr. Todd further insinuates, that he should have understood Dr. Vaughan as meaning to say that he had made mention of nearly forty 'volumes' of manuscripts not mentioned by his predecessors; on the contrary, Dr. Todd must have known such a supposition to be so utterly absurd, that he could not but have known that Dr. Vaughan did not so mean, even while affecting to suppose that such was his meaning. In the third place, it was not, as Dr. Todd alleges, a natural thing in him to reckon the Wycliffe MSS. adverted to by the volume, and not according to the treatises or tracts which the volume might include, inasmuch as Bale, Lewis, Baber, every one who has written concerning those MSS., all have described them piece by piece, whether long or short, and each by its title or beginning, and inasmuch as Dr. Todd himself has pursued this course on all occasions, excepting in this one instance, in which, as we have seen, he had a particular reason for departing from his own practice in this respect, and from that of every one else. In the fourth place, the pieces enumerated by Dr. Vaughan, allowing the mode of enumeration ascribed to him by Dr. Todd to have been adopted, amount to thirty-six, and not to thirty-two only. In the fifth-place, Dr. Vaughan has not counted parts of treatises as being separate works, in any instance that we find, unless it be in the case of the pieces—*De Apostasia*, *De Simonia*, *De Blasphemia*, which Dr. Todd alleges are parts of the work intitled

De Veritate Scripturæ ; but Dr. Todd is the first person who has so described these pieces, and as Dr. Todd confesses his inability to decipher even the chapters of contents to the volume in which these pieces are found, we must confess that we have no such faith in his general accuracy on such matters as to account his solitary testimony on this point of any great value.

On the whole, we think our readers will perceive that it is not often that so narrow a space as that presented in the above extract is found to include so large an amount of error ; and that this pretended defence, while leaving the original accusation wholly untouched, exhibits only a further display of the mental or moral infirmity which it was meant to conceal.

The next charge against Dr. Todd relates to the assertion that to his 'knowledge,' Mr. Lewis was acquainted with the existence of the 'nearly forty MSS.' mentioned by Dr. Vaughan, and that he has 'used, mentioned, and described' every one of them ; and Dr. Vaughan, adducing evidence to the contrary of this assertion, challenges Dr. Todd to show the ground on which he persists in ascribing such knowledge to Mr. Lewis. The whole of Dr. Todd's reply to this challenge is in the following curious passage :

'I had shown that Dr. Vaughan's boast of having included in his catalogue 'forty MSS. preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, the existence of which had been hitherto unknown to the reformer's biographers,' must be reduced at least one-half, even after allowing what he tells us 'every ingenuous man might have seen at a glance,' that the word 'unknown' in the above-quoted announcement meant only 'not particularly mentioned by,' and that 'the reformer's biographers' meant specially Mr. Lewis.'

Dr. Todd, it seems, had 'shown' that Dr. Vaughan's 'nearly forty' MSS. should be reduced below twenty. Our readers have seen *how* it is that Dr. Todd has so done, and will no doubt admire the taste which could descend to repeat such an assertion, after such exposure of the dealing on which it had been founded. But the most amusing part of this paragraph, is that in which Dr. Todd asserts that in speaking of the knowledge possessed on this subject by the 'reformer's biographers' he did not mean 'specially' Mr. Lewis ; and that by the knowledge attributed to them, he has not meant, in the case of Mr. Lewis or of others, a knowledge indicated in a 'particular mention' of the said MSS. Now in the name of everything ingenuous, let the following passage be read attentively, it is Dr. Todd's, italics and all :—

'I set myself to compare Mr. Vaughan's list with that of Mr. Lewis, for the purpose of ascertaining what the newly-discovered MSS. were, and, notwithstanding my previous suspicion, I confess I was surprised to find *that it did not contain a single article which was not already mentioned and described by Mr. Lewis.*

We must leave our readers to judge whether this reference to Mr. Lewis, as one of the reformer's biographers, be, or be not, 'special;' and we must leave them also to judge whether the knowledge on this point attributed to Mr. Lewis, be, or be not, a knowledge said to be indicated by a 'particular mention' of the MSS. in question. Driven from the above assertions in favour of the knowledge of Mr. Lewis in 'special,' Dr. Todd would now take refuge among the 'reformer's biographers' in general; but since Mr. Lewis must be supposed to have known at least as much on this subject as his predecessors, we are obliged to suspect that our critic will find this move, in common with every other he has taken, a move, according to the old adage, from bad to worse.

Concerning the original misrepresentation on this point, that of describing Dr. Vaughan as claiming to have called the public attention to nearly forty new *works* of the reformer's, while he merely spoke of having so done in respect to that number of new *manuscripts*, Dr. Todd has nothing to reply, except that he thinks nine persons out of ten would so understand the language of Dr. Vaughan! This is in effect to say, that duplicate manuscripts of works existing only in manuscript, are things the existence of which it is so difficult to suppose, that Dr. Vaughan ought to be understood as saying he has found, what he does not say he has found—viz., so many new *works* of the reformer, and not what he does say he has found—viz., so many new *manuscripts*! Could we think Dr. Todd so obtuse as really to believe this, we should have left his imbecility to the range of its own necessary harmlessness.

There is still one other point in this unique sort of defence deserving attention:—

'Dr. Vaughan now admits,' says Dr. Todd, 'that he was, and is, except from my statement, ignorant of the existence of the *'Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliæ et Hiberniæ,'* published in Oxford in 1697; and because he and two gentlemen whom he consulted (neither of whom have ever been known to have turned their attention to the subject) were ignorant of the existence of this book, he concludes that Mr. Lewis must have been ignorant of it too!

'Surely this is a little too bad. But if Dr. Vaughan now, after having published a life of Wycliffe, admits publicly his ignorance of so well known a book, to which one should have thought he would have had recourse in the first instance, in order to ascertain what MSS. of his author were in existence, he cannot complain if doubts are expressed of his qualifications for the task which he was bold enough to undertake.'

This passage, when examined, will be found to be in beautiful keeping with the rest. Pray from whom was Dr. Vaughan

likely to obtain information as to the existence of a printed catalogue of the MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, if not from its resident fellows, to whose special keeping the manuscript library is intrusted, so that no man can copy or read a line in it without one of those gentlemen being present? From whom was this information likely to be obtained, if not from Dr. Sadlier, the librarian, a gentleman who, from his years, his tastes, and his office, was likely to be much better informed on this subject than any other man to whom application could be made? The insinuation, then, that Dr. Vaughan did not look to the best source for information is not honest; he looked to that source, and it failed him. But on the matter of this printed catalogue, a letter has been addressed by Dr. Vaughan to the Editor of the 'British Magazine,' which we shall insert in this place, as affording a further display of Dr. Todd's ingenuousness:—

'SIR,—It was not until a day or two since that I had given sufficient attention to Dr. Todd's recent communications in your pages concerning myself, to perceive that in the matter of the supposed printed catalogue of the Wycliffe MSS., in Trinity College, Dublin, I had committed an oversight, and one of which undue advantage has been taken.

'Dr. Todd describes the book to which he refers as a catalogue 'of all,' and 'of the whole,' of the MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin. Being satisfied that no such printed catalogue in respect to the Wycliffe MSS. in that collection had ever come under my notice, I at once confessed my ignorance as to its existence. On recurring to the subject, however, I find that the catalogue intended, so far from being unknown to me, is one which came under my examination in the Bodleian Library nearly twenty years since; and this fact would have occurred to me immediately, had not Dr. Todd's description of that publication been such as to create a totally false impression on my mind in respect to it.

'My papers relating to the Wycliffe MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin, taken at the time of examining those documents, contain a list of more than sixty MSS., the several small pieces included in the 'Pore Caitif' being counted together as one. In the printed catalogue to which reference has been made with so much confidence, the following are the whole of the insertions that occur in relation to the MSS. of Wycliffe.

'129. Tracts of John Wycliffe, 8vo. 148. Determinatio Jo. Wicliff, 1379. 401. Excerpta ex Jo. Wicliffe de Veritate Scripturæ. An exposition on Psalm cxliii. 4to, F. 42. 758. M. J. W. Tractatus de Veritate Scripturæ, Simonia, Apostasia, Blasphemia, fol., membr. c. 3. 812. (Pore Caitif) Discourses of Jo. Wicliffe touching the Ten Commandments: the P. N. of Perfect Life, Ghostly Battle, to Love of Jesus, of Contemplative Life, and of Chastitie. In old English, 8vo, parchment. II. 75. 813. Jo. Wicliffe's Postills, in old English,

fol. parchment, c. 35. 814. Jo. Wicliffe's Works to the Duke of Lancaster in 1368, 4to, parchment, H. 17.'

'Here we find eight insertions, or, at the most, eleven, in place of between sixty and seventy. In the case of seven of these insertions, there are only five so descriptive as to enable any man to discern the sort of MSS. intended. These seven insertions, it is probable, Mr. Lewis read, but the insertion numbered 758, he does not appear to have seen, and I think I can perceive the cause of his not having seen it. The other articles are all referred to in the Index, under the name 'Wiclif,' and the name of the author is printed in each instance in full; but No. 758 is not so pointed out, and in the place, the initials only of the name are given. It was my error to do nearly twenty years since, as my predecessor appears to have done a century before—viz., to rely on a treacherous index. It was not until I had examined the MSS. in Dublin, that I became aware of the pitiable deficiencies, in this respect, of this much boasted catalogue.

'Now Dr. Todd appeals to the fact that this catalogue was printed in 1697; he next assumes that Mr. Lewis must have seen it; and supposing Mr. Lewis to have seen it, Dr. Todd then proceeds to deride the notion of there being any Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin with the 'existence' of which, at least, that writer was not acquainted. Who would not conclude from Dr. Todd's manner of expressing himself on this matter that the said catalogue would be found to contain a list of the Reformer's MSS. hardly less specific, as to number and sort, than Dr. Todd himself might have supplied? But strange to say, on examination, the sum of the matter proves to be, that a catalogue consisting of eleven articles has been proclaimed as sufficient to have enabled Mr. Lewis to 'mention and describe' articles to some six times that amount! May I not ask, Sir, in the language of Dr. Todd, if this be not 'a little too bad'? But thus much concerning what Mr. Lewis might have learnt from this printed catalogue concerning the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin; will Dr. Todd so far gratify your readers as to show—show on the ground of proper evidence and proof—to what *extent* Mr. Lewis found the Bishop of Kilmore and Dr. Howard more communicative than this printed catalogue?'

Such, then, are the notions of the honourable which Dr. Todd has brought with him to his labours as a critic. He repudiates the thought of being hostile to Dr. Vaughan on the ground of his being a dissenter; but however he may deceive others, or deceive himself by such a protest, we are not to be deceived by it. It is less disreputable to Dr. Todd to suppose that he has been prompted to these courses by his haughty feeling as a churchman, than to suppose that he has descended to this tissue of crooked practices from the pure love of indulging in them. Dr. Todd is one of a class. It is as such that we have dealt with him. It is on this account that we would urge our readers to mark the elements of his character, and to remember

them. Pride, egotism, and intolerance, are the impulses which govern these men, and between churchmen of this class, and British Congregationalists, many a hot war must be expected to ensue. We shrink not from the collision. We covet rather than fear it. We are disposed to do its proper homage to real piety wherever we find it, and we know how to estimate at its proper value the honourable and the generous in the man of the world; but the religion which only serves to make its possessor a bigot, and which, as the consequence, tends to vitiate all the natural sentiments of the heart, in place of improving them, is a base thing, which we can never fail to denounce and loath.

We have entered more thoroughly into this subject than our limits ordinarily permit, partly on account of our regard for a gentleman who has rendered eminent service to the body whose principles we advocate, and partly for the purpose of showing the mean arts of detraction to which church writers frequently resort when compelled to refer to the labours of our brethren. The well-earned reputation of Dr. Vaughan is an offence to our opponents which has prompted many ungenerous attacks, distinguished alike by party spleen and intellectual imbecility. Those which we have had under review on the present occasion, partake of the common features of their class, and may safely be left by Dr. Vaughan to the judgment of all impartial men. Two opinions cannot be entertained by the candid of any party respecting the course pursued by his assailant, and we leave Dr. Todd, with little respect either for his intellect or his heart, to enjoy the fruits of his acrimonious and feeble assaults. That there are honourable men amongst our opponents we do not question, but truth compels from us the statement, which we make reluctantly, that such is the bitterness of spirit distinguishing many of them, that we look in vain to their productions for literary integrity, or the common courtesies of life. We regret the fact, not on our own account, but for the sake of our common Christianity, and call upon all our friends to take warning by it. We have nothing to expect from the justice of our opponents, and must therefore befriend ourselves if we would have our literature sustained, or our principles understood by the great body of our countrymen.

In these concluding passages, and in some others, we have given expression to our honest judgment with regard to the labours of Dr. Vaughan; but there are circumstances connected with this controversy which render it expedient that we should so far depart from our custom in such matters as to state that, as regards the substance and form of the *argument* contained in this article, both in respect to the alleged authorship of this Lollard Treatise, and in respect to the character of the Wycliffe MSS.,

and Dr. Todd's papers in relation to them, the writer responsible is the author of 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe,' and it is not the wish of Dr. Vaughan to be at all shielded from that amount of responsibility, under the anonymous character of a review.

Art. II. *A Scripture Herbal*. By Maria Callcott. 8vo. pp. 544. Longman and Co. London. 1842.

THE beautifully simple motto which Lady Callcott has set upon the title-page of this very handsome book, creates a predisposition in favour of the author, and serves very well to counteract the somewhat chilling effect which this luxurious style of 'getting up' a book sometimes produces; it is from Handel's Oratorio of Solomon—

' What though I trace each herb and flower
That drinks the morning dew,
Did I not own Jehovah's power,
How vain were all I knew !'

This favourable predisposition is strengthened when we turn to the preface, and read, ' My chief object and aim in writing this little book has been to induce those who read and love God's written word, to read and love the great unwritten book which he has everywhere spread abroad for our learning.' And we are altogether overcome, when, a little further on, we learn that the production of this work has for three years beguiled the irksome leisure of a sick bed.*

The ' Scripture Herbal' does not, however, need the indulgence which these circumstances would not fail to secure for it.

* Since this article was written, the papers have announced the death of this excellent and truly accomplished lady. She was the wife of Sir A. Callcott, the royal academician, whom she married in 1827, being then the relict of Capt. T. Graham, R.N., as whose wife she travelled in India, and visited South Africa, South America, and other parts of the world. She had other opportunities of travel with her father (Rear Admiral George Dundas), and with Sir A. Callcott. Some of the results are occasionally produced in the present book, and others have been given to the public in her different works, which were rather numerous, and some of them valuable. A memoir in the *Athenæum* describes Lady Callcott as ' noble, direct, generous, forgiving, quick, sensitive, kind, sympathetic, and religious.' All who knew her will hold her memory in affectionate remembrance. Her acquirements and knowledge were extensive. She was an artist both in feeling and practice, an excellent linguist, and her memory was extremely accurate and tenacious. Few women had seen so much of mankind, or travelled so much; and none, perhaps, had turned the results of their activity to more benevolent account. After having been confined to her room by illness (brought on by a ruptured bloodvessel) for *eleven years*, she died Nov. 21st, at the age of fifty-four.

Although intended and fitted for the drawing-room rather than the study, this is, without doubt, the best separate work we possess, in English, on the Botany of the Bible, and it would, in some respects, still be so, were the botanical articles in Dr. Harris's 'Natural History of the Bible,' printed in a separate form.

Lady Callcott enumerates in her Preface the authorities from whom her materials have been chiefly drawn. They are the well known Latin and English books on the subject, with the addition of some travellers, such as Tournefort, Bruce, Sonnini, Russell (Aleppo), and Dr. Royle. In the body of the work, we also perceive, occasionally, the names of Tavernier, D'Arvieux, and Burckhardt. In this list of names (which are the same that occur in Dr. Harris) it is singular how few are there of persons who travelled *in Palestine itself*. It must be very evident that an examination of the *actual* products of the country would be likely to afford the most information concerning those which are mentioned in the Bible. Yet by a singular perversity, this, the most obvious course, appears to have been almost studiously neglected; and even those writers who have gone so far as to perceive that travellers ought to be consulted, have turned to books of travels in Arabia, Egypt, Abyssinia, Persia, and India, all of them countries very different from Palestine in climate and productions, and have passed over the only land whose plants it was really important to consider. Shaw and Hasselquist have been almost the only travellers in Palestine usually consulted, and it appears to have been unknown that there are a hundred other travellers writing in Latin, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, from whose works a tolerably complete *Flora Palastinæ* might be compiled. The German travellers are especially rich in such materials, but the labour of collecting them is not to be expected from the compilers of books for the parlour and the drawing-room, and is indeed such as only a very stout student would be disposed to undertake. The right course was perceived by Celsius, in his *Hierobotanicon*, and by Hiller, in his *Hierophyticon*, who availed themselves of such information of this description as they could command; and it is this chiefly which gave to their decisions respecting the plants mentioned in the Bible, that authority to which most subsequent writers have leaned, and which their learning alone would not have secured. Bochart—a great name in this branch of Biblical literature—was at least equal to Celsius as a philologist, and his superior in erudition; but from the insensible rather than the acknowledged influence of this reference to positive facts, it is Celsius, and not Bochart, whose conclusions have been the most implicitly followed. It must be very evident that, without a preliminary knowledge of the phy-

sical constitution and actual products of the country, a writer will be in constant danger of identifying the plants named in the Bible with such as do not and could not grow in the land of Canaan; and, for ourselves, we should hesitate to say that a particular plant was denoted by the scriptural name, until we could ascertain that this plant actually grew in the country. For want of proper attention to this point, some singular mistakes may be found in all the books on Scriptural botany which we possess—this one of Lady Callcott's not excepted.

The present writer takes a very just view of the labours of her predecessors. Of Dr. Harris's *Dictionary of the Natural History of the Bible*, she speaks with just praise; but observes, that 'it is not, as the ingenious writer imagines, so perfect as to supersede the necessity of any other;' which, we will take the liberty of saying, is true also of Lady Callcott's own book, as far as regards the Botany of the Bible. The work of Rosenmüller on the *Mineralogy and Botany of the Bible*, (as translated in the Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet,) was not seen by this lady until her own work was nearly ready for the press. Of this she writes—'At first, the great array of learned names at the foot of each page alarmed me, even more than the words in oriental characters. But I was soon satisfied that Rosenmüller, although a diligent and laborious compiler on Scripture matters, had depended for his botany upon the authors whom I had already consulted; adopting their quotations as his own.' This opinion of Rosenmüller's work will startle many of our readers; but it is just, and, what is more, it applies to nearly the whole of the large work (*Handbuch der Biblischen Alterthumskunde*) of which this is only a portion. Of another important part of it, the *Biblical Geography*, so competent a judge as Professor Robinson pronounces that this 'work appears to have been compiled hastily, and without extensive research.' In fact, the reputation of Rosenmüller, as a Biblical antiquarian, is now very much on the wane in Germany; and his character for learning and industry will eventually be found to rest almost exclusively upon his *Scholia*.

Before quitting the 'Scripture Herbal,' we should notice that every description is accompanied by an engraving of the plant described. The drawings were made from nature, or from good authorities (which are named), by Lady Callcott herself, and the engravings appear to have been carefully executed. Many of them of course represent familiarly known products, such as the ash, cucumber, elm, hazel, ivy, leek, myrtle, oak, vine; and it has often occurred to us to doubt the expediency of introducing in works of this description pictorial representations of things with which no one can be supposed unacquainted. An engraving

of a leek, for instance, may be proper in connexion with botanical definitions, or in works intended for the instruction of people in whose countries leeks do not grow ; but elsewhere it would seem altogether useless and somewhat absurd. As the cost of such works is thus often much enhanced by pictures of objects which are seen every day, the matter claims this passing notice.

Art. III. *Library Edition of Shakspeare.* By C. Knight. 8vo.
Vols. I.—VI. London: Knight and Co. 1842.

WE can easily imagine the astonishment, not to say consternation, of Mr. Knight, a faithful and enthusiastic editor of the *FACILE PRINCEPS* of dramatists, (ancient or modern,) when he finds that we propose commencing the present article by a deliberate examination of probably, in his view, the fanatical question, whether it be not the duty of Christians to abstain from reading his favourite author altogether, and to discourage others from reading him ; in other words, whether Shakspeare ought to be condemned to a sort of *index expurgatorius*, or whether, with certain cautions and limitations, he may still be allowed to go at large : or rather, we propose to consider what is the wisest and most expedient course for Christians to pursue with reference to a large class of imaginative writers, both in verse and prose, of which Shakspeare is but a representative. If his name therefore occurs frequently in the present article, it is to be considered only as a single exemplification of our meaning ; the principles laid down apply not to him only, but to many others. We further propose to offer a few remarks on the best method of conducting that difficult part of education which relates to the *imagination*—the manner in which the unquestionably natural appetite for fictitious literature may be most safely regulated and gratified.

If our editor's patience and equanimity should not be quite equal to such a discussion—a discussion which he can hardly think less than an insult to his great author, we must beg him to pass on to those parts of this article which more immediately concern himself, where he will find, we trust, matter calculated to compose and pacify him ; and, amongst other things, ample proof that his laborious, arduous, and faithful labours have not been overlooked or unappreciated. In the meantime, we hope he will not lightly charge *us* with anything fanatical, without reading what we say ; without doing so, all he will be at liberty to infer, and all we are convinced which his known candour will permit him to infer, is, that we proposed to discuss the question,

but whether we discussed it well or ill, or decided it in the affirmative or negative, he must leave to those who feel an interest in it. We can assure him, however, that we feel it necessary to discuss it; that, incredible as it may seem to him, there are ample reasons in our estimation for so doing.

We pass on, then, for the present, from Mr. Knight to the class of persons with whom is our more especial business on the present occasion; whose piety we unfeignedly respect, with whose scruples we know how to sympathize, whose judgments, if wrong, we would seek to enlighten, and if right, to adopt. We need not say that it is a discussion which affects professed Christians only—those who are not, have nothing to do with it; they will seek their amusement, or intellectual excitement, wherever they can get it, and whether it be in Shakspeare, or in the pages of more questionable dramatists, will not give them a moment's concern.

We address ourselves, then, to the class of Christians who say, 'In our judgment the danger of moral pollution from the perusal of Shakspeare is so imminent, and is so ill compensated by any amount of intellectual gratification or improvement; and, further, we are so incapable of assigning, or even conceiving, a limit between the use and abuse of such an author, that we are determined to proscribe him altogether—neither to read a syllable of him ourselves, nor, so far as we have influence over the minds of others, to suffer *them* to read a syllable of him.'

We have stated the opinions and the resolutions of these persons, as we deem, fairly. In proceeding to canvass that opinion and resolution, and to suggest whether there be not a wiser and better course, we shall not deem ourselves compelled to assert the direct opposite of the proposition on which they lay so much stress. We do not think that any one in his senses, with correct notions of Christian morality, can assert his belief that the pages of Shakspeare are wholly innocent, or that he is to be recommended to the indiscriminate perusal of all persons (especially the young), by those who are their instructors and guardians. It is, in our opinion, just one of those many practical questions in which no universal or unlimited propositions can be laid down. It is true that this involves the trouble of assigning limitations in treating the question generally, and even then imposes on every individual the trouble of acting on his own responsibility in adopting those limitations, but this is no more than is necessary in a thousand cases of practical morals, and we must even submit in patience and calmness to endure the prescribed trouble, and to act on the alleged responsibility. It is not permitted to cut the knot; no summary process is possible. To assert exclusively either the one extreme or the other, is but fanatical or

pernicious, and must lead, in our judgment, to more mischief than it can obviate. It may be quite true that very many cannot read Gibbon's History without great danger—danger far greater than could result from reading Shakspeare—the danger of losing both their morals and their faith at the same time. Yet to assert that none should read him, would be as foolish as to recommend him to indiscriminate perusal. What should we think of the wisdom of those who should declare, ‘Gibbon is so dangerous a writer that we will never either read a syllable of him ourselves, or suffer any over whom we have any influence, to read a syllable of him?’ The only course left us—a course not to be evaded—is, that each individual should distinguish carefully the various cases in which the one or the other course should be adopted; should consult his judgment whether it be wise or unwise to read him, or suffer him to be read, by those over whom nature, or commissioned authority, or moral influence, has given any control. It may be said, perhaps, that the instances are hardly parallel; that it is conceivable that there may be many cases in which the perusal of Gibbon may be attended with a preponderance of advantages, but that in relation to Shakspeare, no similar cases can be alleged. We might content ourselves with replying that this is begging the question; that to us it appears, as we shall hereafter show, that there are not a few cases where the knowledge of Shakspeare is attended with a vast preponderance of advantages; and that, on *that* supposition, even the above admission gives up the argument, since it implies that, if, as in the case of Gibbon, there be any such instances, it is no longer wise to act upon the peremptory principle of rejecting at once and altogether that which is susceptible of abuse.

But, in fact, the objection that the cases of Gibbon and Shakspeare are not strictly parallel, does not precisely touch the difficulty we had in view in stating it. We question altogether whether, when it is impossible absolutely to proscribe an author, to exclude him from general literature, as is the case with Shakspeare, Gibbon, and a thousand others, it is wise or prudent to attempt a crusade which must be unsuccessful,—which will strike men, whom we would fain influence, as fanatical,—which would so far defeat the very object we have in view, and which would, in the very attempt, absolutely prevent us from exercising a healthful control where it is so especially needed. To form the unlimited resolution, ‘I will neither read Shakspeare myself, (nor by parity of reasoning, any portion of literature that is not perfectly free from moral taint,) or suffer any whom I can control to do so,—what is it but to renounce altogether the only means of correcting the supposed evil, of exercising a judicious influence over the habits of the young, and by watching and directing their studies in ima-

ginative literature, of preventing the ill effects which might follow from their unaided and clandestine perusal of what they know to be forbidden. That the proposed proscription would be impossible, is to us as clear as any proposition that could be submitted to us. That individual Christians may, if they please, come to the resolution of never peeping into his condemned pages—that they may burn them, banish them from their library, is most certain, but it is equally certain that there are vast numbers even of their fellow Christians whom they will not get to imitate their example; still less those youths dependent on their care, who are not yet Christians, and who are more likely, as all experience proves, to be revolted by such an austerity than to acquiesce in it. These will read him either clandestinely—a thing in itself most undesirable—in their very pupilage, or all the more eagerly and heedlessly the moment they escape from it. We repeat, that to proscribe Shakspeare is an absolute impossibility; all that is given us is, to control for good the tendency to become familiar with his writings. He so pervades our literature, lives in such familiar and perpetual quotation, supplies so many of our thoughts, images, and allusions, is cited so frequently even in moral and religious works, that to keep intelligent and educated youth in absolute ignorance of him is impracticable; and as they are sure to meet with others of their own age who have read him, and who will urge *them* to read him, it is almost certain that they will make themselves more or less acquainted with his works. And far happier and safer is it, in our opinion, for a youth to have been introduced under a parent's or instructor's eye, to some knowledge of this author—to have had his excellences and his vices early pointed out—to have acquired a discriminating knowledge of his beauties—and to have been early inspired with a just distaste for his deformities, under a severe, yet judicious criticism, than to be left to take his chance of plunging in absolute ignorance, and without a guide, into his fascinating pages, just when the passions are the strongest, and authority is no more.

If the attempt, then, to proscribe Shakspeare be impossible, we cannot think it expedient. One of the reasons we have just given; but as it is a point of great importance, and affects *many other works* besides those of Shakspeare—nay, a very large portion of general literature—we are induced a little longer to dwell upon it. We think such systematic proscription inexpedient, then, for the following reasons:—

1. It tends by the inevitable—if you will, the perverse—constitution of the human mind in its present state, to defeat the very object it has in view. It turns curiosity more intensely towards the object; what is absolutely forbidden becomes more strongly desired; a new and adventitious interest is given to what is so

jealously guarded. The expedient of loudly proclaiming that Shakspeare is so charmingly wicked, that he must not be read, is about as wise as that adopted in some curiously expurgated editions of impure classics, in which the obnoxious passages, instead of being simply erased, are intimated by an alluring series of asterisks, which at once excite a prurient curiosity and a polluted imagination, and point out precisely the passages of the more ample editions, where both may be abundantly gratified. They form, in fact, an index to the licentious, and save them all the trouble of a long and laborious search. It is not thus we shall act, if we are wise; if we know of any authors who are really dangerous, and respecting whom we have any hope that we may keep the young in salutary ignorance of them, we should take care not to name them at all, instead of setting them down in our *index expurgatorius*. Where there is no power to enforce such an 'index,' we are convinced that it would be but an advertisement to 'heresy,' and would induce ten to read, where it led one to abstain from reading. We could illustrate our meaning at this moment, by saying that such and such authors ought never be read; but acting on our own maxims we do not choose to name them, lest any of our young readers should be immediately tempted to open their proscribed pages. If at any period the young, by some accident, happened to become acquainted with the names of such authors, we should then treat the individual case with all the judgment we possessed; if we saw probability of their perversely meddling with such pernicious lore, we should forewarn them individually of their danger, but should not deem it right to call all the world's attention to the authors we wished to put under the ban of our censorship, lest we might tempt those to read whom we could not prevent from reading, and thus carry the infection beyond the reach of the remedy.

2. The next thing that follows this awakened curiosity respecting what has been forbidden, is the feeling that 'stolen waters are sweet;' and the books to which curiosity has been so strongly turned, are read not only with avidity, but by stealth. Manifold are the evils which follow such a course, and must follow it. If the youth can discover little in the forbidden pages which, in his opinion, could justify his guardian's censures and commands, (a thing which is not uncommon where the said guardian is more than an ordinary purist, and places almost *every* work of fiction in his long catalogue of 'livres defendus,') still, at the best, the wholesome, the indispensable reverence for a parent's or teacher's authority is thereby abridged. But even if the youth does discover such matter, still, unhappily, it is read; and, what is worst of all, it is read *clandestinely*. To

read what is even innocent in our own estimation, under the consciousness we are doing something we wish to hide, and which is forbidden by those whom we are bound to reverence and obey, produces a most unfavourable impression on the mind, and directly tends to rob youth of one of its fairest and most hopeful qualities—ingenuousness. Nor is this all; for, as in the very nature of the case, there can be no open, kindly conference on the subject, between the parent and the child, the tutor and pupil, the very mischief is allowed to work on uncorrected, because it is concealed. It is essential to all sound education, that he who attempts to form the mind of the young should know just what that mind is doing; that all it reads and learns should be open as the day; without this, the attempt to educate is like the attempt to prescribe for a disease where the patient conceals the worst symptoms of his distemper. For our own parts, we are convinced that an error on the side of that laxity which allows the young sometimes to read what is not altogether desirable, provided it be done openly, is less dangerous than tempting them by a too stringent severity to read it by stealth. We are convinced that there are not a few who can bear their personal testimony both to the *fact* that this over-severity has led to the extensive perusal, by stealth, of that which has been forbidden, and to the pernicious effects of such stealth upon the mind itself. We have instances in our own eye at this very moment.

3. It is not to be forgotten that where the *cordon sanitaire* has been too strictly drawn around the mind in youth, human nature is but too likely to avenge itself by excesses when that restraint can no longer be maintained; when the period comes, and it must come, when mere authority can be of no avail. This maxim applies universally, and is a most important one in education. Much of the immorality of the youth in the time of Charles II., is to be rightfully imputed to the artificial restraints, the excessive austerity, in which their rigid forefathers had brought them up. Much of their extravagant love of gay amusement and fashionable finery is to be traced to these causes; the flowing locks, and the silken garments, and the gay ruffles, borrowed more than half their charms from the stiff and quaint attire in which their childhood was arrayed.

In like manner, we think it highly probable that the most reckless, omnivorous, and indiscriminating of novel readers, have been, at all events for a time, those from whom that class of works have been most sedulously and jealously excluded in their youth; teaching them that there is some wonderful unknown delight in their perusal, which they do not fail to hanker after,

and of which they will as little fail to possess themselves, the moment they are no longer under a parent's or a master's absolute control. Thus we know it was with ourselves, and thus we know, from testimony, it has been with others. How much wiser and safer another course would be, we shall have an opportunity of showing, when we come to speak of the best manner of rendering youth familiar with imaginative literature. Suffice it here to say, that he who plunges into it at once, and after a youth of absolute abstinence, does so with all the eagerness with which we seek novel pleasures, without a guide to detect the evil and point out the good, and when wholesome authority can be no longer exerted.

4. We are far from being convinced that the best way to guard the youthful mind from questionable influences, is to attempt to throw around it an *artificial* screen of ignorance. It has long been observed that those who are brought up in the profoundest ignorance of the world, are not the best qualified to combat its temptations, when (and the hour must come) they are left to themselves. We are not, it is true, to place temptations in a youth's way, nor to indoctrinate him in aught that is evil, for the purpose of exercising and disciplining his principles, any more than we are wantonly to expose him to heat and cold to make him robust; but as, on the other hand, we would not mew him up in a room all day, for fear some rude blast should blow upon him, so we would not attempt to seclude him in artificial ignorance of that with which he will one day come in contact, and that for the very reason that he *will* come in contact with it. It is surely better and safer that that knowledge should be gradual rather than sudden, disclosed by incidental notices rather than at once, and under our own eye, than when instruction and authority can no longer avail.—To apply this to the present subject; we certainly would not ordinarily put Shakspeare into the hands of a youth still ignorant of him, still less urge him to a perusal; but if he is become already acquainted with his name, as he certainly will somehow or other, and manifests a desire, which if intelligent he also will, to form some acquaintance with him, we should think it far safer to attempt ourselves to give him some knowledge of his beauties and his faults, than to endeavour to perpetuate his ignorance till he is at liberty to dispel it for himself.

5. We are equally far from being convinced that the best way of repelling every moral danger is to make a loud outcry about it; it is so sometimes, no doubt, but not always; and this not merely for the reason already assigned, that in many cases, from the very perverseness of human nature, we immediately invest what is vehemently denounced with an adventitious interest, but because

read what is even innocent in our own estimation, under the consciousness we are doing something we wish to hide, and which is forbidden by those whom we are bound to reverence and obey, produces a most unfavourable impression on the mind, and directly tends to rob youth of one of its fairest and most hopeful qualities—ingenuousness. Nor is this all; for, as in the very nature of the case, there can be no open, kindly conference on the subject, between the parent and the child, the tutor and pupil, the very mischief is allowed to work on uncorrected, because it is concealed. It is essential to all sound education, that he who attempts to form the mind of the young should know just what that mind is doing; that all it reads and learns should be open as the day; without this, the attempt to educate is like the attempt to prescribe for a disease where the patient conceals the worst symptoms of his distemper. For our own parts, we are convinced that an error on the side of that laxity which allows the young sometimes to read what is not altogether desirable, provided it be done openly, is less dangerous than tempting them by a too stringent severity to read it by stealth. We are convinced that there are not a few who can bear their personal testimony both to the *fact* that this over-severity has led to the extensive perusal, by stealth, of that which has been forbidden, and to the pernicious effects of such stealth upon the mind itself. We have instances in our own eye at this very moment.

3. It is not to be forgotten that where the *cordon sanitaire* has been too strictly drawn around the mind in youth, human nature is but too likely to avenge itself by excesses when that restraint can no longer be maintained; when the period comes, and it must come, when mere authority can be of no avail. This maxim applies universally, and is a most important one in education. Much of the immorality of the youth in the time of Charles II., is to be rightfully imputed to the artificial restraints, the excessive austerity, in which their rigid forefathers had brought them up. Much of their extravagant love of gay amusement and fashionable finery is to be traced to these causes; the flowing locks, and the silken garments, and the gay ruffles, borrowed more than half their charms from the stiff and quaint attire in which their childhood was arrayed.

In like manner, we think it highly probable that the most reckless, omnivorous, and indiscriminating of novel readers, have been, at all events for a time, those from whom that class of works have been most sedulously and jealously excluded in their youth; teaching them that there is some wonderful unknown delight in their perusal, which they do not fail to hanker after,

and of which they will as little fail to possess themselves, the moment they are no longer under a parent's or a master's absolute control. Thus we know it was with ourselves, and thus we know, from testimony, it has been with others. How much wiser and safer another course would be, we shall have an opportunity of showing, when we come to speak of the best manner of rendering youth familiar with imaginative literature. Suffice it here to say, that he who plunges into it at once, and after a youth of absolute abstinence, does so with all the eagerness with which we seek novel pleasures, without a guide to detect the evil and point out the good, and when wholesome authority can be no longer exerted.

4. We are far from being convinced that the best way to guard the youthful mind from questionable influences, is to attempt to throw around it an *artificial* screen of ignorance. It has long been observed that those who are brought up in the profoundest ignorance of the world, are not the best qualified to combat its temptations, when (and the hour must come) they are left to themselves. We are not, it is true, to place temptations in a youth's way, nor to indoctrinate him in aught that is evil, for the purpose of exercising and disciplining his principles, any more than we are wantonly to expose him to heat and cold to make him robust; but as, on the other hand, we would not mew him up in a room all day, for fear some rude blast should blow upon him, so we would not attempt to seclude him in artificial ignorance of that with which he will one day come in contact, and that for the very reason that he *will* come in contact with it. It is surely better and safer that that knowledge should be gradual rather than sudden, disclosed by incidental notices rather than at once, and under our own eye, than when instruction and authority can no longer avail.—To apply this to the present subject; we certainly would not ordinarily put Shakspeare into the hands of a youth still ignorant of him, still less urge him to a perusal; but if he is become already acquainted with his name, as he certainly will somehow or other, and manifests a desire, which if intelligent he also will, to form some acquaintance with him, we should think it far safer to attempt ourselves to give him some knowledge of his beauties and his faults, than to endeavour to perpetuate his ignorance till he is at liberty to dispel it for himself.

5. We are equally far from being convinced that the best way of repelling every moral danger is to make a loud outcry about it; it is so sometimes, no doubt, but not always; and this not merely for the reason already assigned, that in many cases, from the very perverseness of human nature, we immediately invest what is vehemently denounced with an adventitious interest, but because

read what is even innocent in our own estimation, under the consciousness we are doing something we wish to hide, and which is forbidden by those whom we are bound to reverence and obey, produces a most unfavourable impression on the mind, and directly tends to rob youth of one of its fairest and most hopeful qualities—ingenuousness. Nor is this all; for, as in the very nature of the case, there can be no open, kindly conference on the subject, between the parent and the child, the tutor and pupil, the very mischief is allowed to work on uncorrected, because it is concealed. It is essential to all sound education, that he who attempts to form the mind of the young should know just what that mind is doing; that all it reads and learns should be open as the day; without this, the attempt to educate is like the attempt to prescribe for a disease where the patient conceals the worst symptoms of his distemper. For our own parts, we are convinced that an error on the side of that laxity which allows the young sometimes to read what is not altogether desirable, provided it be done openly, is less dangerous than tempting them by a too stringent severity to read it by stealth. We are convinced that there are not a few who can bear their personal testimony both to the *fact* that this over-severity has led to the extensive perusal, by stealth, of that which has been forbidden, and to the pernicious effects of such stealth upon the mind itself. We have instances in our own eye at this very moment.

3. It is not to be forgotten that where the *cordon sanitaire* has been too strictly drawn around the mind in youth, human nature is but too likely to avenge itself by excesses when that restraint can no longer be maintained; when the period comes, and it must come, when mere authority can be of no avail. This maxim applies universally, and is a most important one in education. Much of the immorality of the youth in the time of Charles II., is to be rightfully imputed to the artificial restraints, the excessive austerity, in which their rigid forefathers had brought them up. Much of their extravagant love of gay amusement and fashionable finery is to be traced to these causes; the flowing locks, and the silken garments, and the gay ruffles, borrowed more than half their charms from the stiff and quaint attire in which their childhood was arrayed.

In like manner, we think it highly probable that the most reckless, omnivorous, and indiscriminating of novel readers, have been, at all events for a time, those from whom that class of works have been most sedulously and jealously excluded in their youth; teaching them that there is some wonderful unknown delight in their perusal, which they do not fail to hanker after,

and of which they will as little fail to possess themselves, the moment they are no longer under a parent's or a master's absolute control. Thus we know it was with ourselves, and thus we know, from testimony, it has been with others. How much wiser and safer another course would be, we shall have an opportunity of showing, when we come to speak of the best manner of rendering youth familiar with imaginative literature. Suffice it here to say, that he who plunges into it at once, and after a youth of absolute abstinence, does so with all the eagerness with which we seek novel pleasures, without a guide to detect the evil and point out the good, and when wholesome authority can be no longer exerted.

4. We are far from being convinced that the best way to guard the youthful mind from questionable influences, is to attempt to throw around it an *artificial* screen of ignorance. It has long been observed that those who are brought up in the profoundest ignorance of the world, are not the best qualified to combat its temptations, when (and the hour must come) they are left to themselves. We are not, it is true, to place temptations in a youth's way, nor to indoctrinate him in aught that is evil, for the purpose of exercising and disciplining his principles, any more than we are wantonly to expose him to heat and cold to make him robust; but as, on the other hand, we would not mew him up in a room all day, for fear some rude blast should blow upon him, so we would not attempt to seclude him in artificial ignorance of that with which he will one day come in contact, and that for the very reason that he *will* come in contact with it. It is surely better and safer that that knowledge should be gradual rather than sudden, disclosed by incidental notices rather than at once, and under our own eye, than when instruction and authority can no longer avail.—To apply this to the present subject; we certainly would not ordinarily put Shakspeare into the hands of a youth still ignorant of him, still less urge him to a perusal; but if he is become already acquainted with his name, as he certainly will somehow or other, and manifests a desire, which if intelligent he also will, to form some acquaintance with him, we should think it far safer to attempt ourselves to give him some knowledge of his beauties and his faults, than to endeavour to perpetuate his ignorance till he is at liberty to dispel it for himself.

5. We are equally far from being convinced that the best way of repelling every moral danger is to make a loud outcry about it; it is so sometimes, no doubt, but not always; and this not merely for the reason already assigned, that in many cases, from the very perverseness of human nature, we immediately invest what is vehemently denounced with an adventitious interest, but because

the very knowledge of the said danger might never have presented itself, had it not been for our solicitude and fidgetiness about it. We have said that it is not possible to prevent a youth's becoming acquainted with Shakspeare, but if anything could stimulate a prurient curiosity, make a young mind hunt after impurities, and try to understand equivoques, which might otherwise glance from the mind without being understood or without being heeded, it is the frequent and earnest mention of them. There is many a temptation in this world which would not even be understood, were it not for that over-solicitous purity, or that prudish folly which proclaims it; no doubt with the best possible design, but often with most pernicious consequences. It is sometimes well not to make the young mind too distinctly conscious where danger lies. We have heard a wise and experienced schoolmaster say that when, in translation, his young pupils come upon a questionable passage, which he thinks it most likely they will simply not understand if he does not make a *fuss* about it, he just lets them blunder through it in their own way, when they generally give an obscure and unintelligible version, which, however, answers his purpose just as well as any other; whereas, if he were to say, 'You must omit that passage, it is too indelicate, too gross to be translated,' it is ten to one but he would stimulate the curiosity of his pupils, and that they would never rest till they had mastered it. We do not say that the impurities in Shakspeare could in general be as little understood as the said passages in a dead tongue, (though we are convinced that very many of them would be, without an artificial stimulant,) but we do say, that if anything could tempt the mind, which *will* read him, to think of such passages, to be on the look out for them, to dive into their meaning, to give them vividness, it would be the incessant talk about them. There are a thousand evil things which make no impression upon us whatever, simply because we do not know them to be evil, and which we see as though we saw them not, till some kind Mentor, in the plenitude of his wisdom, gives them an interpretation and attracts our attention to them. He who should conduct a youth into a great city, and say, 'Such and such places are the purlieus of licentiousness, there is the lurking place of this vice or that, take care never to go there; such and such are its outward symbols and appearances, beware of them;' might be a very good man, and have very good intentions, but whatever his pretensions to the simplicity of the dove, he would assuredly have none to the wisdom of the serpent. In very many cases, however little he designed it, he would be nothing more nor less than a sign-post to perdition.

For these, and similar reasons, we do not think it wise in Christians to undertake an indiscriminate crusade against Shaks-

pere ; and, by parity of reason, against all similar literature, or attempt an absolute and undistinguishing proscription of it. If this course were possible, more might be said for it, if not, the question is fairly open,—‘Is such a course expedient, in preference to that of abstaining from all such futile attempts, and endeavouring to regulate that which we cannot prevent?’ Our answer, and the reasons for it, we have endeavoured to give, and that without taking into account the positive advantages which a knowledge of this great poet may confer. On this we shall presently touch. In the meantime we may fairly beg those who plead for an opposite course, to recollect how far in consistency they ought to go. This would, in our judgment, at once reduce their argument to an absurdity. For on the same grounds on which they would absolutely proscribe Shakspeare, namely, that there is in his writings much which a correct moral taste cannot approve—they ought also absolutely to proscribe Chaucer, Dryden, Pope, Swift, even Spenser, Addison, Steele, and a host of others ; almost all dramatic, and a large portion of historic literature. For reasons quite as strong, though not quite the same, they ought also to explode the far greater part of prose fiction, and no inconsiderable portion of philosophy. If such a project be felt to be fanatical and impracticable, and that the attempt to carry it out could only make those who endeavoured to effect it, lose all authority and influence over the very parties whom they wish to protect, there is nothing left for us but to endeavour, with patience and judgment, to extract the evil from the good, and to render a familiarity with a literature which we cannot summarily consign to an *Index Expurgatorius*, as healthful and as innocent as we can. Nor would it be difficult to show—as is indeed evinced by experience in the immense majority of cases—that a wide knowledge of literature is attended by advantages, intellectual and moral, great enough far to overbalance the evils with which it may be attended. The mental activity it creates and cherishes, the discipline it furnishes to all the faculties, the innocent pleasures it affords, the hours of indolence and vacuity it fills up, the temptations which it shuts out, and which are sure to fasten on the ill-informed or the unemployed, more than repay the danger of occasionally stumbling on a questionable passage, or even on a passage the impropriety of which is not questionable.

At the hazard of being tedious, we must notice one or two indirect objections. It is sometimes said, ‘But is the reading of Shakspeare an employment in which a Christian would wish to be engaged?’ We answer, that if there are any, and we believe there are many, who can truly say, ‘we read Shakspeare, not for his impurities, (and when we come to them, deeply

lament them and gladly pass them by,) but for the profound knowledge of our nature he confers—for the deep wisdom and the exquisite poetry in which he abounds—for the invigorating stimulus which he imparts, as well as for the mental refreshment that he brings; we read him not to excess, but as an occasional solace from other and more arduous pursuits, and so reading him, we believe that, directly and indirectly, he is of more advantage than disadvantage to us, or rather that the good is considerable, and the evil just none at all; we see no more reason why they should be ashamed of perusing him, than of doing many other things into which the religious element does not immediately enter. Does the objection imply that the Christian would not wish to do anything, however innocent, into which the religious element does not enter? If it does, it proves too much, and there are few who would be hardy enough to maintain it. If it does not, it does not touch the above-mentioned cases.

But it is further said, 'Though there may be many to whom the moderate perusal of Shakspeare may be a source of innocent delight, or even of positive improvement, ought they not to forego it for example's sake?' We reply, first, that this must be left to the individual's judgment, for it does not necessarily follow that in every case we are not to use that which may, by possibility, be abused; secondly, we are to consider whether our neglecting altogether such an author is likely to deter others from reading him; and if we are convinced that it will not, in other words, that the absolute proscription of him is an impossibility, and that such an attempt would be regarded as fanatical, then the question returns, which we have already treated at such length, whether it would not be better to endeavour to regulate what we cannot prevent, and turn to some use what we must otherwise leave to be simply abused?—But if it be meant that we are not to read Shakspeare, lest those over whom we have as yet an absolute control, and whom we have a right to command—that is to say, children and pupils,—should be induced to read him from our example; then we reply, that, in our judgment, if education be what it ought to be, no such result need be feared, and that the objection comes rather singularly from those who hold that the parent's and instructor's authority is such that he can absolutely proscribe Shakspeare if he pleases. We all know that we do every day a thousand things which we do not permit our children to do, and which, consequently, they never wish to do, and neither they nor we wonder that it should be so. We hold that that system of education is essentially defective which goes upon an opposite principle, and says to the parent or the instructor, 'Never do that which you would not wish your children or pupils to do.' It is a maxim never more than *professedly* acted upon—*practically* it

cannot be. If it be merely meant that we are never to do anything we are convinced is wrong, of course all will assent to it; but there are many things which we are persuaded are not wrong, but which, nevertheless, we should be very sorry to see our children do, before they come to years of discretion. We hold that there has been something radically defective in the education of a child, when, if the question be put, 'May *I* not do this, for I see *you* doing it,' it is not a sufficient answer, 'No, you may not—when you get older you will be able to see why you may not do it now, and why you will be at liberty to do it then; in the meantime you must be willing to yield to my authority, and refrain from doing that which *I* say you must not do, even though I be unwilling to give you the reason, or you incapable of comprehending it, if it were given.' And thus we *do* act in all cases where it suits us, and we never see that any harm comes from it; we give our children different food from what we take ourselves—we take wine, which we do not allow them—we keep different hours—we go where we should not trust them—and lastly, which is more to the point, we all of us *read books with which we should not let them meddle*, and we see no reason why, so far as *this* objection goes, Shakspeare should not also be added to the catalogue. Let that parent depend upon it that he is proceeding on a vicious maxim when he protests 'that he will do nothing which he would not let his children do, or for which he cannot render to them a reason.'

What we have said of parents and children applies also to ministers, and the young of their flocks. It is professionally the duty of ministers to read many works of philosophy and theology which he would be very sorry to see familiarly in the hands of his young charge; and for similar overbearing reasons—though not the same—which lead him to read much that is heretical and profane in theology and philosophy, he may choose to cultivate some acquaintance, even with such a poet as Shakspeare; that is, that *indirectly*, though not directly, he may be the more thoroughly furnished for his arduous and complicated functions. He may feel that having to work upon mind—the intellect, the affections, the will, of man—it is of vast importance to him to be familiar with those portions of literature which give him the profoundest and truest views of human nature, suggest matter of reflection, stimulate his own intellect and imagination, store it with images, and increase his command of energetic and powerful language. And if *he* honestly feel that he can read Shakspeare with these advantages (to say nothing of his rightful title to occasional mental recreation), while on the other hand he can do so without danger of contamination, (and really we must be permitted to smile at the peculiar quality of that

piety which is more likely to be polluted by the impurities of Shakspeare, than to be repelled or disgusted with them,) we do say that he is perfectly justified in reading him, even though he should deem his flock had better abstain. We do not affirm that it is a duty of every minister to avail himself of this liberty, or that all need such a stimulus alike, but we do affirm, that he who deems it right to avail himself of it is perfectly justified in saying to any of his flock who blame him for it, 'Far from contending that I read nothing, and ought to read nothing but what I would put freely and without discrimination into the hands of the young, I boldly acknowledge that I do read, and must read, much which I would not wish to see you familiar with.' We think that this is wiser than a questionable attempt to proscribe Shakspeare altogether, and far more honest than reading him by stealth—consigning him, when not in use, to some dusty upper shelf, or concealing him behind a screen of theological folios.

But there is assuredly one class in whom it is a *duty* to read Shakspeare; and let us not be lightly charged with paradox if we affirm that to that class must be referred all those who say he ought not to be read at all, and who propose to use their influence to proscribe him altogether. For what can be more preposterous than that they should condemn that of which they are ignorant, and set up as censors without the only qualifications which can constitute them judges. If any man really wish to give authority and weight to the opinion that Shakspeare had better never be read at all, and would not lose all influence over those on whom he wishes to exert it, let it be seen that he speaks not in ignorance, but from knowledge. On the other hand, if, as we think, such an attempt at sweeping proscription would be inexpedient, because vain and impracticable, it is scarcely less a duty to obtain some knowledge of this author, that we may know in each case how to offer wise and judicious counsel, and to form the minds and the tastes of those who might otherwise obtain an acquaintance with him under far more unpromising circumstances.

We have repeatedly said that we have employed the name of Shakspeare only as the representative of a class. What we have said of him equally applies to a large portion of literature, poetical, historical, and philosophical. We have chiefly used his name, only because it is frequently brought up in this controversy, a natural consequence of his vast popularity. We again affirm that it is impossible and unwise to lay down any universal principles, and that we must be content to adopt a course equally removed from a sweeping and short-sighted condemnation of all such literature, and a recommendation that it should be indiscriminately perused by all classes, and by

persons of all ages. We must, as in many other practical cases, be content to form our judgment, and offer our counsel according to the exigencies of individual cases, and any other course would, we are persuaded, for the reasons already so largely assigned, tend to produce far more mischief than it could possibly prevent.*

But we must not quit this subject without laying down some general principles which, in our judgment, ought to be kept constantly in view by those to whom is committed the arduous task of education, in relation to that most difficult and delicate subject, the culture of the imagination.

Locke has written a treatise on the 'Conduct of the Understanding;' another, assuredly not less useful or necessary might

With regard to the objection, quite a distinct one—that the perusal of Shakspeare may tempt to the theatre, we deem it requisite to say a few words, and but a few. If the attempt to proscribe Shakspeare (and by parity of reasoning, a very large portion of general literature) be, on the general grounds stated by us, inexpedient and unwise, and savouring of something very like fanaticism, it may well admit of question whether this is the best way of endeavouring to repress (and we have no hesitation in saying all Christian parents ought to repress it) a love for the theatre. The young are much more likely to distrust the conclusion that the theatres are an improper place, than to acquiesce in ignorance of Shakspeare. In fact, it is endeavouring to gain an object which may be urged on the strongest, most obvious, and rational moral grounds, by questionable and insufficient means. The real, the true reasons for forbidding the theatre, are such as all can equally understand; it is not that dramatic action is represented there, (for it is at least possible to conceive that plays might be acted perfectly free from everything objectionable,—nay, some such are even now acted;) it is the *concomitants* of the theatre—the characters which usually congregate there—the associates likely to be formed—the temptations which are sure to present themselves—the whole moral atmosphere of the place—and we cannot but think that the solemn warnings addressed by a Christian parent on these rational grounds are likely to be both far more intelligible and far more impressive, than a vague hatred and an indiscriminate condemnation of all dramatic literature, especially as the objection must be carried so far as to call in question the judgment of him who urges it, and extend, not only to all dramatic literature, but to all that is capable of being dramatized. We may perhaps further say, that the temptations to go to the theatre, and which do in *nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand*, actually prevail with youth, by no means result from an abstract love of the beauties of dramatic literature; that if a man has been so well trained as to appreciate and resist those temptations, it is not a perusal of Shakspeare or of Ben Jonson which will be likely to take him to the theatre; and that if he has *not* been so trained he will go there, though he has not troubled his head in reading one page of either. As far as our experience goes (we know not what may be that of others), the most enthusiastic and discriminating readers of Shakspeare are those who have not seen him represented, while the most besotted and ardent lovers of the theatre have been but very moderately versed in him,—nay, we verily believe, in the majority of instances, would have been sorry to be condemned to a solitary perusal of him.

be written on the 'Conduct of the Imagination;' for no part of the whole process of education requires a more discriminating judgment or more assiduous care.

As this faculty was implanted in us by the same wisdom which has bestowed every other, we may be sure that it was designed to fulfil important purposes in the economy of human life, and to be, just like them, a source of happiness if rightly used, of misery if not. We may also fairly infer that it falls under the same conditions with all the other faculties, and requires, in order to secure its beneficial exercise, watchful and careful culture. It must in early life be neither pampered nor starved. Either extreme is full of danger. To starve it is no doubt the easiest and shortest method, and relieves the parent or the teacher of all that responsibility and care which we have represented as so imperatively demanded of him. To repress as far as possible all exercise of the imagination—to forbid all works of a fictitious character, is a brief and summary process. But whether it be the best or wisest remains to be seen. If the system be acted upon so severely and successfully as to induce in a youth permanent and habitual distaste to every exercise of the faculty, he is at best sent into the world, not such as a complete education should have made him a *man*, with all his faculties duly and harmoniously developed, but with one essential faculty of his nature dwarfed and stunted—with a maimed and distorted intellect; he is also cut off from one important and fruitful source of innocent pleasures, and which might be, and often are, substituted for others of a more questionable character. But if the process be not successful—the far more frequent case—nature will ultimately assert her rights, and avenge the restraint which has been artificially laid upon her; the consequence will be a more indiscriminate and greedy indulgence in pleasures from which it has been wholly debarred, and with that absorbing and dangerous delight which ever attends absolute novelty: all this, too, when the judgment of others older and wiser is no longer to be had, or is no longer minded. We have been astonished, we confess, at an opinion recently expressed, that inasmuch as poets have too generally been a very wicked sort of persons, it is a question whether the imagination, as if it were a suspected gift of Divine providence, had not better be discountenanced and repressed altogether—doubtless, a very short and easy method for the instructor, but fraught with equal ingratitude towards God, and folly with regard to man. The true method is to exercise in each individual case the diligence, judgment, and care, for which we have so often pleaded, and which are not to be evaded by any such fanatical procedure, dictated by indolence,

impatience, or shortsightedness. The true method is not to prohibit all such reading indiscriminately, but to provide the youthful imagination with its proper, wholesome aliment; to see that while the greater portion of a youth's time is given to robust and strenuous exercises of intellect, these shall not be pursued to the absolute neglect of an important function of his nature; to take care to render those very exercises healthful and beneficial, by alternating them with the pleasures derived from lighter reading, but still so moderately as to show him that such pleasures are to be his recreation and his solace, not his business, the reward and recompence of industry, not the lure and refuge of indolence; to furnish him with such carefully selected works as may early form a high and pure taste, and render him, as he approaches manhood, impatient of what is not in the best style of art; and lastly, to furnish him with this moderate and wholesome aliment *early*, that this peculiar species of enjoyment may not have the dangerous charm of absolute novelty at those years, when, as so often said, authority ceases to exist before reason has assumed its ascendancy, and the youth is in that perilous condition in which he can no longer be controlled by the judgment of another, nor safely depend upon his own;—in a word, when he is no longer a child, and yet is far from being a man. This, we humbly conceive, is a better course than either of the two we have denounced. It is true, the duty is a difficult one, but so are many others, which, no one would suppose, are to be therefore evaded. It is true, it is also difficult, or rather impossible, to select such works as may not be accidentally abused to evil. Even Robinson Crusoe, if tradition speak truth (and there is nothing improbable in the supposition), has sent more than one boy to sea. What then? an objection which proves too much, proves nothing. For the same danger, the same liability to abuse, extends to the cultivation of every faculty, and even to the communication of knowledge in any shape. Is it therefore better that we should be brought up in barbarism and ignorance, because in one case out of a hundred, or a thousand, knowledge itself may be turned to the purposes of vice or infidelity? What is required of us is, to choose that course which on the whole seems to be the safest and the best, and to endeavour to perform our duty with fidelity and circumspection, and to the best of our judgment. If we do nothing in the matter of education, except where we can be quite certain that what we do may not be attended with evil results, we shall do little enough.

We now return to the work, the appearance of which, as will be seen, we have made the mere occasion of this long and, as it appears to us, important discussion. We know not whether the

excellent and indefatigable editor requires any apology for our having so long kept him waiting. We are quite sure, however, there are many to whom the subject we have been treating is of vital interest, and has not seldom grievously perplexed them. If we have said anything which may tend to relieve them, we shall not deem that we have penned these pages in vain.

Our remaining remarks will be exclusively confined to Mr. Knight and his editorial labours. To enter on so familiar a subject as Shakspeare's merits, after so many able critics have written so largely upon it, would be somewhat superfluous; and to enter on such a vast field in the narrow space which is all that is left us, would be not a little absurd.

We have no hesitation whatever in saying that Mr. Knight's edition of Shakspeare is, in all respects, the most valuable which has yet been given to the public, and that we cannot easily believe that it will soon be rivalled. There are, perhaps, a few commentators on Shakspeare who may have exceeded Mr. Knight in power of critical analysis, and some, though not many, who may have surpassed him in antiquarian and bibliographical lore, and who have been more profoundly acquainted with our early literature. But we much question whether there has ever been one who has united to so large an extent, and in such happy combination, the various qualities which the task pre-eminently requires. He conjoins the capacity of thoroughly appreciating the most refined beauties of his author with the most plodding and painstaking diligence in collating editions and forming a text; a discriminating estimate of all the large and subtle views of such commentators as Johnson and Coleridge, with a laborious and exact attention to the minutiae of verbal criticism. And if his power of analysis is not so great as that of the writers above mentioned, still the reader is not defrauded in this edition of any light they have thrown upon the author. It has, in fact, in addition to all its other merits, that of combining most of what is truly valuable in preceding editions—of furnishing a *resumé* of all the best and most judicious criticisms.

Mr. Knight belongs decidedly to the modern school of Schlegel, Coleridge, and others, whose æsthetic principles lead them to a far more 'reverential' and cautious criticism than was manifested by their predecessors. They refuse lightly to believe that expressions which there is any sound reason to believe are as Shakspeare left them, can be lightly amended by another hand, or that alleged errors in the conception of a character, or the conduct of the drama in any particular instance, are really such, merely because to a superficial criticism they may appear so; or that apparent marks of ignorance—as, for example, the anachronisms of which Shakspeare's commentators have made so

much, may not be often better accounted for upon another principle, namely, that his 'knowledge might have been in subjection to what he required, or fancied he required, for the conduct of his dramatic incidents.'

In a word, he refuses to believe that Shakspeare was, as Voltaire is pleased to represent him, a sort of inspired barbarian, who worked in obedience to a blind impulse, but who was destitute of art or method; or that he was the ignorant being many others have been pleased to imagine him. In both these respects we are persuaded that he is in the right, and not less so in the latter particular than in the former. We believe that Shakspeare's *powers were universally great*—that his faculty of acquisition was as enormous as his power of invention and combination—that though he might have had but 'little Latin and less Greek,' he devoured all the literature that was then open to him, and that he made more out of that little than other and inferior poets would have made out of ten times the quantity. We believe, then, the principles of the modern Shaksperian school of criticism to be in the main correct, but it is possible to carry them too far in minute instances, and thus to weaken them as applied to the more important. It is thus we think with the defence of minute points, sometimes set up by Coleridge, and we are by no means sure that Mr. Knight has not suffered himself to be now and then betrayed into a similar error. It is not necessary, in order to an adequate appreciation of Shakspeare's genius, absolutely to idolize him, or to suppose that his intellect was absolutely free from all mortal infirmities; that he is not guilty of occasional slips and blunders; that he was not subject to moments of obliviousness, or oversights of negligence, like other men. By way of illustrating our meaning, we shall give a brief specimen of what we deem Mr. Knight's excessive enthusiasm. As all the world knows, Shakspeare, in his 'Two Gentlemen of Verona,' has represented Proteus as going from Verona to Milan by sea, both being towns far inland: to one who should think proper to object this to Shakspeare, the proper and the obvious answer surely is, 'Be it so; say it was an error of ignorance, or, which is more probable, that it was a slip of forgetfulness, and that if the poet had bethought himself for a moment, or if he had not regarded the point as of no moment, he would have put Proteus into a carriage instead of a ship—how is Shakspeare's genius affected by it?—what depends upon it?' This is in effect *one* of the answers which Mr. Knight has given — to us it is quite sufficient, and would equally apply to many other points equally insignificant. But this will not altogether suffice our editor in his *general* anxiety to leave

Shakspere chargeable with the least possible amount of error or ignorance. He takes occasion to intimate that the supposed error may have been designed—that there may have been some profound æsthetical reasons for the inadvertence, which our more prosaic generation is too dull to perceive or appreciate; whereupon he offers us a great deal of very ingenious and really beautiful criticism, truly applicable to a great many more important cases, about the ‘subjection of the real to the imaginative,’ and so forth. We accept, and accept gratefully, the criticism, but deny it to be precisely relevant to the present occasion. We wish it had been reserved for one of the more important cases just referred to, and fear that many, finding it in the place it now occupies, will conclude that it does not apply so forcibly in other cases as it really does, and argue that it is the over-refined speculation of a critic who is determined that his author shall on no occasion be in the wrong; that the admiration and homage it indicates, however profound, are not so discriminating as they should be. This would be unjust in Mr. Knight’s case, but it would not to us be matter of surprise, if some so thought. For, in the case of the above inadvertence, it is reasonable to ask, ‘What is the proof that Shakspere had any profound or subtle reason for making Milan and Verona seaport towns? What was the necessity here of subjecting the ‘real’ to the ‘imaginative’? What in the conduct of the piece depends upon it?’ Absolutely nothing, if we except two or three indifferent puns of Speed and Launce, which Shakspere’s exuberant wit and inexhaustible love of verbal quibbling could as easily have produced under any other conceivable alternative. ‘But,’ it may be said, ‘it is still *possible* that there may have been some profound reason, though we cannot discover it.’ Why, it is difficult, of course, to prove that there may not have been such a possibility; but we must reason on *probabilities*. Here, on the one side, is a perfectly natural solution of the difficulty—a slip, an inadvertence, with the certainty that Shakspere, as mortal, could not have been free from such things; and, on the other, a bare possibility; even the most acute and sagacious critics, finding it impracticable to assign any worthy reason of the designed commission of the apparent blunder, anything in the conduct of the plot depending on it, anything of dramatic propriety necessitating it! Homage to mortal genius, however great, should be still discriminating; without this quality, it loses a portion of its intrinsic value. It must not be carried so far as to lead us to guess that there may be some subtle propriety in casual inadvertencies, profound wisdom in palpable mistakes, deeper reasons than we wot of, even for the most indifferent actions, though we cannot assign,

or even imagine them; some subtle fetch of policy, some master-stroke of art in stumbling over a stone, knocking at the wrong door, or misdirecting a letter.

Similar remarks apply to attempts to discover some æsthetical propriety in Shakspeare's making ancient Greeks talk of 'nuns,' or describing Hamlet as having been at school at Wittenberg. Our answer, in all such cases, still is, 'Be it so; let them stand for inadvertencies, which if the author had thought on the matter, he would not have made;—what of it? Do a score of such things weigh the hundredth part of a scruple in the estimate of his marvellous and superlative genius?'

Mr. Knight, indeed, offers a sort of apology for his indulging in such a long criticism on the insignificant matter, to which we have referred by saying that it 'was necessary, on the threshold of his enterprise, to make a profession of faith with regard to what many are accustomed to consider irredeemable violations of propriety in Shakspeare.'

We have already said that we accept the criticism itself; but we again say that we could have wished the principles, and the limits within which they were intended to apply, had been either elaborately set forth in a separate *excursus*, or that they had been reserved for the first *important* case in which they are truly of force. In the main, however, we think Mr. Knight's principles of criticism are perfectly legitimate, and judiciously applied; and perhaps it was unavoidable that an enthusiastic editor should be sometimes tempted to lay a little greater stress upon them than they will bear; for it has been the general fault of biographers and critics, in the case of authors who could furnish far feebler apologies for indiscriminate admiration.

Perhaps a similar observation may apply to some of Mr. Knight's elaborate criticisms on minute and very doubtful points. They may be partly defended on the plea, that nothing regarding Shakspeare can be uninteresting, and partly excused on the ground that it is impossible for his commentators not to become enthusiasts. We can pardon much to the spirit of a diligent and genial editor.

The general 'Preface' contains an account, so far as it can be authentically ascertained, of the number of Shakspeare's works, of the order in which they appeared, of the dates of their publication, and of the principles on which Mr. Knight has proceeded in forming his text. In Mr. Knight's opinion, Shakspeare commenced the composition of his dramas, at least five years before the period generally assigned,—that is, about 1585, instead of about 1591. We confess, that to our minds he has made this matter abundantly clear; nor do we see how any man with his observations in mind can hereafter apply Spenser's well-known allusion

contained in the lines, entitled, the 'Tears of the Muses,' published in 1591, (in which the author of the 'Faery Queen' speaks of 'our pleasant WILLY,') to any other dramatist than Shakspeare, and sooth to say, even without them, it is difficult to comprehend how any one could have applied them to any of his contemporaries.

The judgment and diligence displayed by Mr. Knight in the formation of his text, is deserving of all praise. He has very properly taken the folio of 1623, published by Shakspeare's 'fellows,' John Heminge and Henry Condell, for his basis, carefully collating with it the quarto editions of those separate plays which had been already published.

That it was very necessary that the common text, or rather texts, of Shakspeare should receive a thorough revision, is abundantly plain, if we consider the liberties which a long succession of critics had thought proper to take with him, especially Steevens, whose text, if any, may be considered the '*received*' one. Steevens began well; but how he ended will best appear from his own candid confession contained in the following citation from Mr. Knight's preface:—

'Steevens set out upon principles which deserve every commendation. He begins his 'advertisement to the reader' thus:—'The want of adherence to the old copies, which has been complained of in the text of every modern republication of Shakspeare, is fairly deducible from Mr. Rowe's inattention to one of the first duties of an editor. Mr. Rowe did not print from the earliest and most correct, but from the most remote and inaccurate of the four folios.' He then states that he had gone through the task of collation with the authentic copies, adding, 'the reader may be assured that he who thought it his duty to free an author from such modern and unnecessary innovations as had been censured in others, has not ventured to introduce any of his own.' He further goes on to say: 'The text of Shakspeare is restored to the condition in which the author, or rather, his first publishers, appear to have left it, such emendations as were absolutely necessary alone admitted; for where a particle, indispensably necessary to the sense, was wanting, such a supply has been silently adopted from other editions; but where a syllable or more had been added, for the sake of the metre only, which at first might have been irregular, such interpolations are here constantly retrenched, sometimes with, and sometimes without notice.' If Steevens had worked throughout his life in this spirit, he would have deservedly earned the thanks of every reader of Shakspeare, and the duty of an editor coming fifty years after him would have been less disagreeable. But Steevens's edition of 1793, which goes by the name of 'his own edition,' and upon which all the modern texts, with the exception of Boswell's, are founded, was executed in a spirit, the total opposite of the principles laid down by the same editor twenty years before. We must extract a passage from his preface of 1793, which is comprehensive enough to

show upon what principles the received text of Shakspeare is founded, and which is, truly, no vain dream of imaginary perfection in an editor who would start back,

‘E’en at the sounds himself had made;’

but of one who carried out his theory with a most unflinching perseverance, and who grew bolder and bolder with every new experiment. ‘It is time, instead of a timid and servile adherence to ancient copies, when (offending against sense and metre) they furnish no real help, that a future editor, well acquainted with the phraseology of our author’s age, should be at liberty to restore some apparent meaning to his corrupted lines, and a decent flow to his obstructed versification. The latter (as already has been observed) may be frequently effected by the expulsion of useless and supernumerary syllables, and an occasional supply of such as might fortuitously have been omitted, notwithstanding the declaration of Heminge and Condell, whose fraudulent preface asserts that they have published our authors’ plays as absolute in their numbers as he conceived them. Till somewhat resembling the process above suggested be authorized, the public will ask in vain for a commodious and pleasant text of Shakspeare. Nothing will be lost to the world on account of the measure recommended, there being folios and quartos enough remaining for the use of antiquarian or critical travellers, to whom a jolt over a rugged pavement may be more delectable than an easy passage over a smooth one, though they both conduct to the same object.’

‘Without the most careful and complete examination of the text of the early copies of Shakspeare, as compared with the modern texts, it is impossible to form any notion of the extent to which the corruption has reached through this dogged pertinacity, and we add with pain, besotted ignorance, on the part of an editor, whose natural acuteness, elegant acquirements, and neat style, gave him an influence over the public of his day, of which we inherit the evil fruits. Malone was the only man who ventured to stand up against Steevens; but Malone’s natural strength would allow no prolonged fight, and his weapons and his armour were of the most fragile of critical equipments. Malone was bred in the same school of metrical harmony as Steevens, but he had a greater terror of innovation; and when Steevens, therefore, came with his ‘expulsion of useless and supernumerary syllables, and an occasional supply of such as might have been fortuitously omitted,’ Malone was ready with his minute proofs, that what is usually received as a monosyllable, was in reality a dissyllable, and *vice versâ*. Neither of them had the slightest notion of that variety which dramatic versification essentially requires, and of which, we conscientiously believe, Shakspeare was the first, the very first, to exhibit the example.’

Of Mr. Collier’s edition we know nothing, not having had an opportunity of inspecting it. But we have read attentively the prospectus with which he has ushered it into the world, and Mr. Knight’s remarks thereon. We must think that Mr.

Knight has ample reason to complain of injustice. While Mr. Collier reasonably complains of the state of Shakspeare's text, as it is found in ordinary editions, and of the negligence or presumption of his editors, he takes no notice whatever of Mr. Knight's labours; or rather, by this course, tacitly leaves it to be inferred that Mr. Knight's text is equally defective with the rest, and that he, too, is to be classed amongst the negligent and incompetent editors. So far from this being the case, Mr. Knight, in our judgment, has really offered the public the very desideratum which Mr. Collier is so solicitous to supply. Mr. Collier talks indeed, somewhat mysteriously, of some exclusive sources of information, on which he places great reliance; but whatever they may be, (though we confess that we should place greater reliance on Mr. Collier's undoubtedly extensive acquaintance with the history of the drama, and on his vast bibliographical lore,) we question whether he can produce a better text than that with which Mr. Knight has furnished us.

But the merits of Mr. Knight's edition do not end with the text. It is scarcely even the chief merit. Each play is preceded by an ample 'introduction on the chronology, state of the text, supposed sources of the plot, period of the manners and action,' &c., full of curious historical matter, and containing much valuable criticism; while each is followed by a 'supplementary notice,' in which the opinions of other critics, as well as those of the Editor, on the characters, incidents, and principal passages, are given at length. Nor is this all. Each act, almost every scene, is accompanied by a body of annotations and 'illustrations,' full of curious and amusing information on the laws and usages, manners and customs, of our ancestors, and forming altogether no inconsiderable mass of traditional and antiquarian lore. These matters are profusely illustrated by those pictorial embellishments, which so largely characterize the literature of the age, and which stamp the present edition of Shakspeare with so novel and unique an interest. Many, very many, of them are of great merit as works of art. The most valuable amongst those published in the 'Pictorial Edition,' have been transferred to the 'Library Edition;' we heartily wish that all of them could have been so transferred, though we do not know how it could have been well managed on the more moderate page of the later edition.—We had almost forgotten to mention, as a further recommendation, that the whole work is accompanied by a running commentary, ample enough, but not too ample, of foot notes, containing all the principal *variæ lectiones*, the reasons which have guided the editor in his preference of one word or phrase to another, and explanatory remarks on obsolete terms, or obscure passages.

There are many passages in Mr. Knight's 'Introductions' which we should like to have extracted, but we have exhausted, and more than exhausted, the space allotted to us. We can only return him our best thanks for the pleasure and entertainment he has afforded us.

Art. IV. *Correspondence of John, Fourth Duke of Bedford; selected from the Originals at Woburn Abbey. With an Introduction,* by Lord John Russell. Vol. I. London: Longman.

THE latter part of the first half of the eighteenth century was a time of fierce political contention. The lower house, nominally only the representative of the nation, was broken up into sections, which contended against each other with an acrimony partaking largely of the bitterness of personal strife. There was little of principle, and still less of patriotism, in the struggles of that period. The great majority of the Commons were intent on anything rather than the welfare of their constituents, and the reports which we possess of their debates—brief and meagre as they are—are evidences of disappointed ambition, fretted vanity, or personal hatred, rather than of an enlightened and honest devotion to the good of the nation. Sir Robert Walpole was the minister of the day, but his long tenure of office was evidently drawing to a close. The causes which contributed to his overthrow were partly personal and partly official, derived in some measure from the dissatisfaction of his colleagues with his avowed supremacy, and still more from his foreign policy running counter to the views of the King.

Walpole became First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer in the spring of 1721, when the dangers arising from the intrigues of the Tory party with the Pretender, and the questionable position of the hierarchy, exposed the nation to fearful perils. The death of Queen Anne, which occurred about six years before, had been anticipated with considerable hope by the adherents of the exiled Stuarts. The evidence we now possess leaves no room to doubt of the negotiations which were on foot just prior to that event, and which there is good reason to believe were connived at, if not sanctioned, by the feeble-minded and bigoted Queen. The strength of the Stuart party at that time was considerable, and the danger accruing from them by no means trifling. 'Among their favourers and well-wishers,' as Lord Russell remarks, in his *Introduction* to the present volume, 'were to be reckoned, in England, the landed gentry, a large portion of the clergy, the University of Oxford; in Scotland, many of the Highland clans, and the episcopal gentry; in Ireland,

the Roman catholics, the great majority of the population of that island.' Against this formidable array were opposed, the Whigs and the Dissenters, the latter of whom were unanimously zealous for the house of Hanover. At one time the result was doubtful,—the scale trembled in the balance, and even bold men began to tremble for the safety of English liberty. Happily, however, the danger was averted, and lasting gratitude is due to the men by whom the ark of our freedom was preserved from captivity. The Whig leaders of 1714, by the promptitude and vigour of their movements, paralysed for a season their Tory opponents, defeated their intrigues, and secured to a new and protestant dynasty the peaceful possession of the sceptre of these kingdoms. Such was the state of parties a few years prior to the premiership of Walpole, and it had experienced little change up to that event. The loyalty of dissenters had been rewarded by the repeal of the act against occasional conformity and that restraining education; but the favours thus shown, though in harmony with the avowed principles of the Whigs, and well merited by the services rendered, only served to embitter the hostility, and to render more active the intolerance, of the church. Sir Robert Walpole perceived this, and on coming into power resolved to abandon his zealous and confiding allies, in order to conciliate the most embittered of the enemies of his party. 'Walpole,' remarks Mr. Hallam, 'more cautious and moderate than the ministry of 1719, perceived the advantage of reconciling the church as far as possible to the royal family and to his own government; and it seems to have been an article in the tacit compromise with the bishops, who were not backward in exerting their influence for the crown, that he should make no attempt to abrogate the laws which gave a monopoly of power to the Anglican communion.*' This has been the usual course of the Whig party, marvellously short-sighted, it is true, yet still persisted in to our day. The forlorn hope of reconciling an implacable enemy continues to be cherished, and former services are in consequence frequently forgotten, and the claims of justice denied. But let this pass.

Walpole was premier when John, Duke of Bedford, whose *Correspondence* is now before us, took his seat in the House of Lords at the age of twenty-two. This was in the year 1732, when the power of Walpole was at its height, though he himself was 'the object of much popular invective, and the theme of much eloquent declamation.' The duke at once ranged himself in the ranks of opposition, and took an active part in many debates, impugning the foreign policy of the ministry, and charging them with despotic and corrupt practices in their conduct of the

* Const. Hist. iii. 333.

home government. The majority of Walpole was gradually broken down. Some of his colleagues proved treacherous, many were discontented at his monopoly of power, and the Prince of Wales, in avowed opposition to his father's government, sought to array all the influence and talent he could command against his minister. William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, was at this time a comparatively young member of the house, and his impassioned eloquence, inflamed with all the warmth of personal resentment, was directed against the minister, whom he denounced for his corruptions, and probably envied for his power. 'We must muzzle that terrible cornet of horse,' said Walpole, when he first heard the withering oratory of Pitt; and, as if his evil genius possessed him in this matter, he proceeded from bad to worse, till the young officer was deprived of his commission, and rendered an enemy for life. On the 9th of February, 1742, Walpole was created Earl of Orford, and two days afterwards he resigned the seals of office.

The administration which succeeded Walpole was but short-lived. The great leader of opposition was bought off with a peerage, and lost at once the admiration and the confidence which his talents and popular services had inspired. It is difficult satisfactorily to account for Pulteney's conduct on this occasion. Seldom had so much political power fallen to the lot of any man. The king and the ministers were dependent on his pleasure; he possessed a clear majority in the house, and was sustained by the strong and almost universal feeling of the nation, yet, to adopt the language of a modern historian, 'he eagerly made terms for himself and a few of his particular friends, bartered his popularity and consistency for a peerage, and assented to an arrangement which offered little prospect of any change of measures.*' Pulteney, it must be remembered, was a thorough Whig, and had held office, together with Lord Carteret, under Walpole. His character was well known by the statesman whom he had served, and his patriotism was therefore subjected to the smile and private solicitations of the king. Having brought about an interview between his rival and George II., Lord Orford exultingly exclaimed, 'I have turned the key of the closet upon him.' The purpose of the minister was effectually accomplished, but the country lost the services of a man from whom it was entitled to look for high-minded and consistent patriotism. Lord Wilmington, whose incapacity was notorious, was made first lord of the treasury, Lord Carteret secretary of state, and Lord Winchelsea first lord of the admiralty. The ministry thus formed was unquestionably a Whig ministry, and, with that preference of rank

* Cooke's Hist. of Party, ii. 305.

above talent which has usually distinguished the tactics of that party, permitted Mr. Pitt to be excluded from its number. That celebrated man was at this time thirty-four years of age. He had already distinguished himself by the great vigour of his parliamentary eloquence, but mere talent, when unsustained by family alliances and a great name, was insufficient to recommend him to the leading Whigs. 'The reader will observe in the course of these letters,' remarks Lord John Russell, 'some curious proofs of the preference given to high rank and great fortune in the distribution of the principal offices of the state.'

Lord Wilmington's death, in 1743, led to a reconstruction of the cabinet, and opened the way for the Duke of Bedford's accession to office,—Mr. Pelham becoming premier, and the Duke of Bedford first lord of the admiralty. In this post he continued till 1748, after which he was secretary of state for two years. The letters published in the present volume relate principally to the former of these periods. They comprise many details of his naval administration, throw considerable light on the temper and political relationships of several public men, and are full of information respecting the negotiations which preceded the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. 'They are almost entirely letters of business, and are chiefly valuable as authentic memorials of public affairs, during a part of the history of this country as a free and powerful state.'

We must now proceed to lay before our readers a few specimens of the letters contained in the collection, and the first we shall give is from the Earl of Bath to the Duke of Bedford, in which the writer attempts to vindicate himself from the charges preferred against him. The confidence expressed in the early part of the extract could hardly have been cherished by Pulteney.

'I agree with your Grace that measures must be changed as well as men, and I verily believe they will be so. Abroad, at least, they manifestly are, and much for the better in every respect. At home it must be our own faults if they are not mended. But whatever turn affairs may chance to take, I am confident that I can justify my own conduct to the world in a very few words. I will only ask this single question, what do I get for myself, after labouring with indefatigable pains for twenty years? Nothing but what I was offered, even at that time; and how I persisted in refusing it till I saw most of my friends provided for in the manner they desired. I wish I could have made the change a little more general; but I know where to lay the blame of that likewise, if it becomes necessary to speak the truth. Upon the whole, I am very sure it is right to make the best of what has been done, and all unite in supporting the honour of our country, this family on the throne, and the present constitution freed from corruption.'—vol. i. pp. 11, 12.

The following, from the Earl of Leicester to the Duke, respect-

ing the electioneering proceedings of Harwich, shows that the practices lately so notorious in that borough are not of modern growth. The letter is dated August 2nd, 1745 :—

‘ Thus your Grace sees plainly how truly I judged, in telling you, and also Mr. Pelham, though he will not yet believe me, that Philipson’s views were to get the borough absolutely to himself, independent of the government; which plainly appears by his having got such people into places as he could depend upon as his own friends, even so far as to lose their places rather than act against him, and those he had been in no way instrumental in putting into office he had so far ingratiated himself to, before he would consent they should be chose on the floor, yet even they would lose their places rather than vote against his interest, even for a member of the corporation; how much, therefore, could be influenced by him for a member of parliament! He works so well with those under me, that they not only refused my orders in the choice of a burgess, but, even while in place under me, and in my chief trust, infamously betrayed me, and not only by my interest brought in his creatures upon the floor, but got them places from me myself, till by his (Philipson) trying to work out Leaths, who first supported him, I had, by Leaths, the whole affair discovered to me. As for Orlibar, surgeon to the sick and wounded, I fear he will act as the others under your Grace have done, for Leaths in order to know how far he would obey Lord Sandwich’s commands, endeavoured to speak to him, and even wrote to him, but to no purpose: he could not get an answer. Thus you see how he has contrived to manage all those depending on your Grace’s office, and the chief under mine; and if Mr. Pelham, who now supports him, does not immediately take care, he will get such into his as Mr. Pelham will have as little power over, and become absolute master of the borough, in spite of the government, but that is no fault of ours; I hope, yet, we may have a struggle for it, and, happen what will, I have had what I value much more than the greatest success in that or any other borough, proofs of your Grace’s and Lord Sandwich’s goodwill to me, which I assure you will ever make the strongest impression on me.’—*ib.*, pp. 31, 32.

A similar remark may be made, respecting the following, from Mr. Grenville to the duke, under date of Dec. 1, 1746 :—

‘ I received your Grace’s obliging letter enclosing one to me in favour of my brother the Captain, for which I give you a thousand thanks. By what we hear from Bridport, I should hope he would meet with success there, if he has only a subject to contend with; but it is given out that an *unlimited credit* has been sent down to that place, and that Mr. Drax, secretary to H. R. H., carries it. The person in whose behalf it is to be exerted is Colonel Madan, one of the Prince’s equerries. If this should be the case to the extent that it is reported (which I can’t believe till I see the effects of it), to be sure my brother will be defeated, as it will then be no match: however, be that as it may, I am sure he will always remember with infinite plea-

sure that he had the honour of your Grace's good wishes and recommendation.'—*ib.*, p. 199.

A letter from Mr. Legge, an old friend and political supporter of the duke, from which we transcribe a paragraph, affords a singular illustration of the complex and very questionable influences which regulate the exercise of patronage. All departments of the state might furnish like specimens in great abundance. Such jobbing, however, ought to be discountenanced by every honest minister, whatever the post he fills.

'A certain lord (whom I know you don't delight in no more than your humble servant does) made me a visit this morning; and, after asking several questions concerning your Grace's kind intentions towards Palliser, gave me to understand that he had thoughts of soliciting your Grace to give that sloop, when vacant, to his brother, and seemed to wish that if I had an opportunity I would co-operate with him. The supposition of my being at all able to assist with your Grace I own was flattering, and I could not help feeling that I liked it very much; but upon recovering my senses, I find that though I am very indifferent as to the successes of that noble family, I am by no means so as to your Grace's ease and happiness, and can only see this in the light of an occasion which may be made to contribute more or less to your own quiet. If it is not done for him he will certainly continue to tease and lay perpetual schemes till it is. He will perhaps plead the examples of Sir John Norris, Sir John Franklyn, Lord Harry Powlet, &c. &c., and of all other lords of Admiralty, who have never failed to give most partial preference to their brothers and sons; and, indeed, the service in general are so used to it, and expect it so much of course, that when it happens they never are surprised or repine at all at it; on the contrary, if it is done with a good grace for his brother, he must be the most ungrateful dog living if he forgets the obligation, or knows any other rule for his conduct at the Board but that of making your Grace happy. To do him justice, he talks in the style of one who would not breed dissensions at the Board; and I rather impute his past behaviour to youth, impertinence, real ignorance of the world, with an opinion of his own to the contrary, than to badness of heart. But I know very little of his inward man; and as to his outward, there is but little of it to know, which is a good symptom.'—*ib.*, pp. 150, 151.

Several notices occur in the course of these letters, of the desperate expedition of the young Pretender in 1745, and they are interesting, as showing the light in which the enterprise was regarded before its result had been attained. Writing from Dublin Castle, under date of September 17th, 1745, the Earl of Chesterfield remarks:—'By the accounts we have from Scotland nothing is more ridiculous than that rascally Highland army with which his Royal Highness Prince Charles intends to conquer us, except it be our army, that runs away from such a pack of

scoundrels. But if they have no foreign assistance, which your grace will take good care to prevent or intercept, there must be soon an end of them, one way or another. I wish other things, now depending, may end as well as I am persuaded this rebellion will.'

The following letter from the private secretary of the Duke of Newcastle, announces the defeat of the Pretender, by the forces under command of the Duke of Cumberland, and it contains some particulars which will be interesting even at the present day:—

'My Lord,—I have the honour to acquaint your Grace, that a messenger arrived this day with letters from his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, dated at Inverness the 18th instant, and containing further particulars of the victory obtained by his Majesty's troops over the rebels; which appears to have been more considerable, as to the number of men lost by them, than was at first imagined. The account sent by his Royal Highness makes the number of the rebels killed, on the field of battle, and in the pursuit, to amount to 2000: other letters, by this messenger, say 2500; and they all agree that the rebels themselves acknowledge that they have lost from 3000 to 4000 men. Many of their chiefs are killed; among whom are Lord Strathallan, Lord Balmerino, (and, it is strongly reported, the Duke of Perth, though that is not so certain,) Cameron of Lochiel, Appen, Kinloch, and many others of the rank of Colonel; and it is supposed by the rebel prisoners that many of their chiefs are killed who are not yet known. There is a long list of prisoners, many of which are of considerable rank; but I do not find Murray of Broughton's name amongst them. All their cannon, all their baggage, and twelve colours are taken; in short, there never was known a more total defeat. The Pretender's son fled very early, and was seen to pass Fort Augustus, with only eight men in his company. He lay that night at Lord Lovat's. Brigadier Mordaunt was sent the next day by his Royal Highness into that country, and went to Lord Lovat's house; but found it empty, and left it in flames. The rebels are supposed to be, in a manner, totally dispersed; his Royal Highness not having been able to learn that there was any considerable number of them anywhere together, so that he was at a loss which way to pursue them.

'We had about fifty men killed, (officers included, of whom there were none of the rank of Captain, but Lord Robert Kerr and Captain Grossette,) and about 250 wounded. The Earl of Cromartie and his son, Lord Macleod, with about 150 private men, are brought prisoners from the county of Sutherland to Inverness.'—*ib.*, pp. 75, 76.

Lord John Russell, after giving a list of the principal members of the Pelham administration, points out two remarkable facts in its construction: the one, that Lord Bath should have belonged to it, and the other, that Mr. Pitt should have been excluded. Referring to the latter circumstance, his lordship says:—

‘Mr. Pitt, as the most eloquent orator, and most brilliant of the rising men of his day, had a fair claim to office on the retirement of Lord Granville. The Pelhams intended that he should be secretary at war. But his invectives against the Hanover troop measures had sunk deeply into the mind of the king, and the royal prejudice could not for the present be overcome. Mr. Pitt, with a forbearance and regard for his friends highly honourable to him, gave his cordial support to Mr. Pelham, and was content to wait, aware that his talents were more powerful to raise, than the royal aversion to depress him.’ —ib., p. xxxvii.

To this aversion of the king, the letters before us make several allusions, but it was compelled ultimately to give way before the rising genius and splendid parliamentary powers of the great debater. ‘I ordered Mr. Stone,’ writes the Duke of Newcastle to the Duke of Bedford, April 28, 1746, ‘to acquaint you that we had prevailed with the king to make Mr. Pitt paymaster. His majesty was determined not to give him the war office.’ The latter appointment fell to the lot of Mr. Fox, which brought into close official connexion the fathers of the men who, in subsequent times, divided between themselves the confidence and the leadership of the two great parties into which the Commons House was divided.

The following letter, from Admiral Anson to the duke, contains an account of one of those naval engagements which served to revive the spirit of the English nation at a period of general depression. It is dated from the ‘Prince George,’ May 11, 1747. The desire expressed, that the French admiral ‘had had a little more strength,’ is thoroughly characteristic:—

‘My Lord Duke,—I know your Grace will have great satisfaction in hearing that anything is done to the disadvantage of the enemy, and especially that it has fallen to the lot of one who has long been patronised and honoured with your friendship; and therefore the 3rd of May gave me the most sensible pleasure I ever felt, when I came up with a squadron of French ships, consisting of five ships of the line, and two frigates of 44 guns. They were going upon two expeditions, one to India, the other to America, and would have done much mischief to this country if they had succeeded, which is effectually prevented, having now in my possession the five largest men-of-war, and four of their richest India ships; and am in great hopes that the Yarmouth, Monmouth, and Nottingham, which I detached to pursue their transports and merchant ships, which are thirty in number, will destroy them all. The enemy’s ships behaved well; but I could plainly perceive that my ships made a much hotter fire, and much more regular than theirs, when they had a superior number, which they had in the beginning, before the ships in the rear could get up. Your Grace will be much concerned to hear that Captain Grenville died an hour after his leg was cut off above the knee: he was by much the cleverest officer I

ever saw. Boscawen got a shot in the shoulder, but is almost well; his behaviour in the action pleased me, and I hope your Grace will make him a rear-admiral. As the *Defiance* is vacant, I should be obliged to your Grace if you would give her to Captain Bentley, who has been my captain this cruise, and is very deserving of a cruising ship. How cordially have I cursed the Dutch, who, I find (by the French general Jonquiere), prevented his whole fleet falling into my hands the last winter, when he came from Chibaton by one of their vessels, informing him he was within twenty leagues of me, and must see me the next morning, upon which he altered his course, and steered for Rochfort. However, I have caught him at the rebound, and ought to be satisfied, but wish he had had a little more strength, though this is the best stroke that has been made upon the French since La Hogue; and I am pleased that something has been done by the fleet whilst your Grace has presided over us; and if you quit us, which I never think of without uneasiness, Lord Sandwich will come to a Board not quite sunk in its credit. He is the only person in the kingdom, after your Grace, that I will serve under: if he continues there seven years, and I live as long, I will never quit him, for I esteem him much. There was 200,000*l.* in specie on board the French ships, and they say the equipping these expeditions cost a million and a half sterling. The *Invincible* is a prodigious fine ship, and vastly large; I think she is longer than any ship in our fleet, and quite new, having made only one voyage. I hope the Duchess is dismissed from her office of private secretary, and that you both enjoy as perfect health and happiness as is the wish of, &c. &c.'—*ib.*, pp. 213—215.

The naval administration of the Duke of Bedford closed in the following year, in consequence of Lord Chesterfield having resigned the secretaryship of state. To that post the Duke succeeded, and brought to the discharge of its duties the same soundness of judgment and vigorous industry which had distinguished him in his former appointment. None of the letters in the present volume relate to the engagements of this office, and the latter part of them pertain almost exclusively to the negotiations at Aix-la-Chapelle. A brief passage in one, from the Duke of Newcastle, shows, that in 1748 the Oxford University was not very loyally disposed to the house of Hanover. It is addressed to the Duke of Bedford, and is as follows:—

'There is also another affair of importance that requires immediate consideration: the University of Oxford are come with their address. It is so indecent and improper, that, in my humble opinion, it ought to be considered, first, whether the King should receive it, then, if received, what answer should be given to it. It will be necessary to consider this with the bishops, and that cannot well be put off longer than Monday evening.'—*ib.*, pp. 594, 595.

We shall be glad to receive the second volume of this work, and in the meantime recommend it to all such of our friends as

are interested in knowing more of the times referred to than our general histories supply. For ourselves, we value the work highly, and unhesitatingly pronounce it to be a valuable addition to our historical literature.

-
- Art. V. 1. *Wesleyan Methodism Considered in Relation to the Church ; to which is subjoined a Plan for their Union and more effective Co-operation.* By the Rev. Richard Hodgson, M.A., Evening Lecturer of St. Peter's, Cornhill. Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly.
2. *Wesleyan Tracts for the Times.* No. 1. 'Why don't you come to Church?' No. 2. *Wesleyan Methodism not Schism.* No. 3. *Apostolical Succession.* No. 4. *Wesleyan Ministers true Ministers of Christ.* No. 5. *Modern Methodism, Wesleyan Methodism.* Mason, Wesleyan Conference Office, City Road.

THE chain of causes and effects it is sometimes difficult to trace, even in physical science, in mental and moral it is much more so. He is a skilful and philosophic historian who can clearly and satisfactorily detect the agencies in the distant past, which have contributed to shape the present to what it is; but he must possess gifts more than human, who can foreshow from present agencies, the results which yet remain to be developed. We of course pretend to no such insight into the future. Prognostication, or divination, falls not within the province of reviewers, whose exclusive business is with the progeny of the press, or the events transpiring in the world and the church. Yet there are tendencies in most things; and in the things of our own times there lie embryos of great and important events. For the issues, which are at no man's command, we must be content submissively to wait.

What will be the future effects of the controversies now agitated none can foretell, though many may indulge themselves in speculations and guesses. The revival and spread of high-church principles has quickened all parties into action. The battle is joined on every side. The house divided against itself has not merely disturbed, but alarmed its neighbours. Puseyism, however, is no novelty. It has long existed, it has always been festering within the church of England. But its offensiveness, its aggressions, its challenges, and its assumptions—are novelties. Few persons would have ventured, fifteen or twenty years ago, to predict that it would find, among the ranks of protestant clergymen and university professors, champions bold enough to head a party for open hostilities against the Reformation, and frantic enough to assert a title to that territory which Rome had appropriated to herself; or rash enough to advise the people of

Great Britain to sue for a joint-proprietorship in the inheritance. But so it is.

Then again, who could have imagined that a party, so utterly disconnected from the church as the Wesleyan methodists, would have felt this controversy as an imperious call upon them to engage in strife from which they have usually kept aloof, or that they would have ventured to implicate themselves as a church, or connexion, or conference, (we know not which term best suits the case) in a debate, the agitation of which among themselves, may lead to consequences which none can foresee, but which many may live to deplore! But so it is; and the world can no longer doubt that men so wise in their generation as the leaders of Conference are allowed to be, have felt the Puseyite controversy touching them in more points than one. They are not persons to be drawn into thriftless contention. They are not accustomed to essay works of supererogation, and the fact that they have designed a series of controversial and defensive Tracts for the Times, is an unequivocal proof that they have perceived the utility as well as felt the need, of such prophylactics.

It would be too curious, and perhaps too delicate an inquiry for us to pursue,—what facts or causes can possibly have induced these gentlemen to bethink them of so unusual a measure? What tendencies appearing among their own friends could have awakened these alarms? Or what desertions, or fears of desertions, could have induced a body so friendly to mother-church, so decidedly favourable to her politics and her polity, to bring forth the whole weight of its ecclesiastical authority to check its fond pretensions, and rebuke the madness of the prophet? Some persons have insinuated that their more respectable ministers and people, (respectable of course in worldly circumstances,) have preferred to bring up their sons to the church, rather than to Methodism; others have stated that some students and young ministers have gone over from Methodism to Puseyism; and again others trace these facts to another—that Methodism itself fosters priestcraft, and begets an inkling for ecclesiastical domination. But of course we affirm nothing of the sort; and we take upon us to repress the prying spirit which seeks to know more concerning the causes in which these tracts have originated, than the tracts themselves disclose. The facts alleged are in substance, that the clergy, looking at the Wesleyans as the most recoverable part of their estranged flocks, have been using of late extraordinary means to recover them; and means which ‘compromise some of the most sacred principles of morality.’ ‘It was hoped that this evil would be of short continuance;’ but ‘this

hope has been disappointed. The nuisance is widely extended, and increases daily. The Wesleyan ministers and societies are therefore informed that a series of tracts is in course of preparation, and will be published with all convenient speed, under the general title of 'Wesleyan Tracts for the Times,' unfolding Mr. Wesley's real views of ecclesiastical order, vindicating the ministers and people who at present bear his honoured name, and supplying an antidote to the ill-disguised popery which has ominously arisen in the heart of the protestant establishment of this country. This series of tracts will be published at stated intervals, of which due notice will be given. The attention of the Wesleyan connexion in general is respectfully invited to this announcement. The Wesleyan Tracts for the Times will not be an attack upon any body of Christians, but an earnest defence of an injured people against a race of intolerant and unscrupulous assailants.'

It appears that many Methodists have been very urgently pressed by this argument—'Mr. Wesley was a churchman—he discountenanced and condemned dissent. It is true that he apologized for his new establishment, by alleging the corruption of the old one; but he always urged his people to keep in the communion of the church. Yet modern Methodism has diverged in a variety of particulars from his principles, and has become either a separation from the church, or a schism in it.' Hence the force of the appeal to those who venerate Mr. Wesley, and profess to be guided by his sentiments. 'The church is vastly improved since his day; the pure gospel is extensively preached in its pulpits, and as he never contemplated the permanence of a sect, or the formation, on professed grounds of scriptural authority, of a dissentient church, in reference to the establishment, you ought now either to merge in the church of England, or harmonize your societies to it, so as to place them under the government and discipline of the hierarchy.'

Our readers will be curious to know how this argument is met by the *Connexion*, or what is the substance of their reply. It is in brief this—there is an anachronism in the appeal of the churchman to Mr. Wesley's opinions, which renders his argument invalid. It is shown that, though Mr. Wesley commenced his labours, and wrote some of his works, with a full belief in the scriptural authority of the church of England, and the perfect accuracy of all its principles, yet he subsequently altered his opinion, and though he never avowed himself a dissenter, yet he embraced the doctrine of presbyterian orders, believed in the divine institution of voluntary churches, their government and discipline by presbyters, and consequently left his connexion in the state of a

separate, regularly organized, and permanent religious community; and that, since his times, the Conference have merely carried on, and acted out, his last matured opinions respecting the church of Christ. Hence the Connexion now-a-days discovers no force in the requirement that they should merge in the church, because they perceive, in Mr. Wesley's later opinions, sufficient grounds to justify them in maintaining themselves independently of all connexion with, and all control from, the established church. This is all very well, and so far so good. Let Wesleyanism take its stand upon scriptural ground, in repudiating the doctrine of episcopal ordination, as essential to the validity of orders; let it maintain scriptural authority for government and discipline by presbyters; let it assert the scriptural right to assemble its people, and form them into churches, or a church, or societies, or a connexion, or whatever else they please to call them; and, in all this, let it be conceded that they are but acting in strict conformity with Mr. Wesley's last views and directions, they have the most perfect and indisputable right to do so; and, with the Bible in their hands, they are assuredly proof against all the assaults of the 'intolerant and unscrupulous assailants,' whom they profess to meet in these tracts.

But is this all? No; certain important inferences follow. The churchman retorts—you have hereby become dissenters; you have done the very thing, committed the very act, which you know full well Mr. Wesley deprecated and forbad. What is the reply which these tracts furnish to this argument? We must give it in the words of the writers:—

'The Wesleyan Methodists are not dissenters, *in the ordinary sense and application of that term*; for they do not dissent from the principle of a national ecclesiastical establishment, which derives a measure of protection and support from its union with the state, nor do they dissent from the doctrine and general formularies of the church of England; and they are not schismatics *in the church*, for this plain reason, that, to a considerable extent and degree, they are separated from the church. They would not affect names which mark parties and distinctions, but they cannot entirely avoid using them; and they are satisfied with the one that has descended to them, indulging the hope, at the same time, of that better day when every sectarian distinction shall cease, and all Christ's disciples shall be one in mind, in heart, and in name. They are *not*, then, *dissenters from the church of England, in the customary use of that expression*; and they are *not* SCHISMATICS *in the church of England*; but they are WESLEYAN METHODISTS.'—Tract No. 2, p. 10.

Again we find in the selfsame tract—

‘Some one may be ready to ask, WHAT, THEN, IS WESLEYAN METHODISM? It must be a strange anomaly. If it is neither schism, nor schismatical separation, in what light shall we regard it? Our answer, which we would make with all humility and gratitude, is this, that singular and even anomalous as the present position of Wesleyan Methodism may be, it is doubtless, in itself, *the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God*. To this our thoughts cannot fail to advert, when we have occasion to speak of the validity of its ministerial orders, and of its other claims as a part of the universal church of Christ.’

On reading this remarkable passage we opened our eyes, and rubbed our spectacles, and read it again and again, asking ourselves at the same time what can the writer or writers possibly intend by ascribing Methodism, when they *have occasion to speak of its ministerial orders*, to an extraordinary visitation and work of God? Do they mean to say that its distinctive principles are the result or fruit of a new revelation, thereby designing to remove it beyond the reach of the common revelation and common test? It is confessedly not church-of-Englandism; it is not dissent from the church of England, which it would seem to be, by asserting the validity of orders which the church denies, and the authority of voluntary societies, which that church repudiates; but it is ‘*the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God*.’ It does not attempt to dispute the validity of church-of-England ordination; it does not dissent from the doctrine of an establishment of Christianity by the state—it even approves of it, as lawful and desirable—and yet it very modestly sets up an independent hierarchy, seeking no such thing as support from the state; but after it has constituted a priesthood, not episcopally ordained, and a church or churches, not conformed to the pattern of the established church, it again very modestly tells the world, ‘this Methodism of ours is the very best and most perfect, and most strictly apostolic church in Christendom. To be sure it is not, in its platform, episcopacy, and it is not dissent from episcopacy; for dissent from episcopacy we hold, with Mr. Wesley, to be a very abominable thing, and we never will allow ourselves to be guilty of it. We have something among us much better than either episcopacy or dissent.’ It is indeed neither the one nor the other, for it is ‘*the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God*.’ This is the only rule by which these tracts direct us to judge of Methodism. Now so far as we have been able to pry into the genuine sense, the obvious intention of this singularly *humble* statement, it seems to affirm nothing less than the superior excellence and authority of Methodism over established episcopacy, and over every form of church government that ranks

under the comprehensive epithet of *dissent*, while it assigns a sufficiently ambitious reason for the preference. We allow that it would have been possible to put a different interpretation upon the words, had they been used in a different connexion, and for a different purpose; but since they are here employed as a reason to show why the Wesleyans are neither churchmen nor dissenters, they appear to us to be of no force, unless they are intended to annul the grounds of the churchman's appeal to them to submit to episcopal authority, and at the same time to set aside the dissenter's argument with them, that they ought to account themselves dissenters of some sort, because they repudiate episcopal ordination, and practically reject the alliance of the state. Hence it is alleged that Wesleyan Methodism does not conform itself to the establishment, because it originates in *an extraordinary visitation and work of God!* and it will not allow itself to assume the character of dissent from that church, for the very same reason. If this does not signify that Methodism claims to be a new dispensation, originating in a new revelation, we cannot understand either its meaning or its pertinence to the case in hand.

Will our readers have the goodness to observe the select phrasology with which this astounding announcement is made? 'Our answer, which we would make with all HUMILITY and GRATITUDE, is this—that *singular*, and even *anomalous*, as the present position of Wesleyan Methodism may be, it is, DOUBTLESS, in itself, *the fruit of an extraordinary visitation and work of God.*' The definition is placed in italics to arrest attention, and it will no doubt receive, both from churchmen and dissenters, the attention it deserves.

This is, to be sure, a very short and easy way of deciding the controversy. It was intended to stop the mouth of the churchman, who believes in extraordinary works and visitations of God; and it equally aims to silence the dissenter, who wishes to view the Wesleyan as placed in the same category with himself. But then, if Wesleyan Methodism disdains to conform itself to episcopal discipline, because it is the fruit of an extraordinary visitation of God, and yet could not for a moment think of dissenting from that episcopacy and that establishment, because both are scriptural and right; and, if in the next place it insists that its own platform of church principles shall be considered the fruit of *this extraordinary visitation and work of God*, exempt consequently from the common test, the old rules and principles of the written Scriptures, it must prepare itself to defend rather more fully than has yet been done, or is likely to be done by twopenny tracts, this new and extraordinary claim. We have

not yet seen any reason to induce us to submit to this modern dispensation, and from the specimens, proofs, and arguments, furnished by these tracts, we do not anticipate the speedy conversion either of the dissenting sects, or of the sects of clergy, Puseyite, evangelical, or otherwise.

It is a very serious matter which these gentlemen of the Conference have now before them, and we cannot but admonish them to be upon their guard as to the consequences, both to themselves and the cause of genuine Christianity, of placing their church-system upon ground which seems to remove it from the law and the testimony, and to claim for it a special foundation of its own. Surely it was in an evil hour, a dire exigency of argument, that the thought occurred of pleading a special or extraordinary visitation of God. Nothing short of the same evidences as sustained the mission of apostles, and those to the utmost fulness, can adequately support this novel, this bold claim. From all such pretensions, we think, they ought to shrink with shame and horror. Churchmen and dissenters will equally demand the proof of inspiration, before they can admit the claim, or agree to concede to Methodism that superiority which, if true, and founded as alleged, ought immediately to supersede all other forms and systems of church-government: for one that is *the fruit of a special visitation and work of God*, so recent as the times of Wesley, can be nothing short of an improved edition of the New Testament, or, to say the least, an authoritative interpretation which decides at once all questions of ordination, government, and discipline. Wesleyan Methodism is hereby affirmed to be God's last visitation to his distracted church! Where are the proofs?

We presume that the writer would deny that such is the necessary sense of his words, and protest that we have perverted his meaning in thus understanding them. We feel perfectly satisfied that he should retract them, or explain them in any other sense he may think proper; but if he refuses this sense, then of what avail is any other to the case before us? If he did not mean to exempt his system from the common test of Scripture, by this averment, then it was his province to have proved from Scripture that Methodism was at least equally founded in divine authority, or had as good a right to plead scripture sanction as either established episcopacy, or any of the forms of dissent. But it was obvious that this procedure must have necessitated one of two inferences—that his system either agreed with or differed from churchism—both which conclusions it was obviously necessary, and previously determined, to avoid. If, on scriptural principle, Methodism rejects episcopacy, in any material point, it

becomes dissent; if it admits dissent from the courted and flattered establishment, it clearly departs from the verbal standard and venerated pattern of its founder; so to avoid, or at least to appear to avoid, both these alternatives, it is made a rule to itself, by setting up for it a special claim, originating in an extraordinary *visitation and work of God*, a prerogative which at once enables it to overleap the 'swamps of dissent,' and place itself beyond the reach of the crosier, which is seeking to overawe it. But deprive the words of this sense, and let them signify nothing more than the happy revival of godliness under Methodism, in the conversion of souls, then they are neither a definition nor a defence of the platform of Methodism, as a church system, but simply an assertion of the divine influence, accompanying, in an extraordinary degree, the efforts and labours of Methodists; and must consequently leave the system itself to work out its vindication in the best way its advocates may, from the common repository of inspired instruction. Then would come the very exigency which the writers of the tracts sought to avoid—the dilemma to which the church-writers have reduced them—and from which, for our own part, we cannot see how they are to escape; for Methodism, if it defends itself by an appeal to the common standards to which all parties refer, must either agree with, or differ from, the established church of these realms. If its advocates assent to the complete scriptural authority of diocesan episcopacy, then comes, by way of awkward consequence, the sin of maintaining an unjustifiable schism, in continuing in a state of insubordination; if, on the other hand, it considerably impugns such episcopacy, it then inevitably sets up a standard of dissent, and becomes confessedly what its founder laboured to prevent its becoming. These are very disagreeable alternatives to men who have always piqued themselves upon observing punctually, and with deferential homage, the judgment of their master. It was a tempting occasion to evade both horns of the dilemma, by asserting that an extraordinary dispensation of grace was given to Mr. Wesley; but alas! they have aspired at a pinnacle too high for men of such humility, as they tell us they are, and the sooner they descend the better, for the dizzy height has already made their brains swim, and will, ere long, betray them into a disgraceful fall.

Certainly it was in an evil hour they were tempted to imitate the tractarians of Oxford, and he was a luckless wight who ambitiously undertook to prove that they were neither schismatics in the church nor dissenters from it.

Let us take another specimen from this master of the Wesleyan Israel:—

‘Some have loved to plead that the Wesleyan Methodists must either be dissenters *from* the church of England, or schismatics *in* it. When able men touch upon this notion, and signify their approval of it, they certainly fall into an inadvertency, which was scarcely to be expected in their case; they do not observe the fallacy which lurks in the indeterminate and ambiguous name, *dissenter*.’

At this point we really expected, from this censor of the *able men* who have fallen into so glaring an inadvertency, a complete masterpiece of dialectical skill. We prepared ourselves for a piece of ratiocination which should have deterred the sons of Oxford and Cambridge from ever daring again to risk their character as logicians, in repeating such a fallacious proposition as that ascribed to the *able men*, or *approved by them*. Will any man venture again to repeat the proposition, ‘Wesleyan Methodists must either be schismatics *in* the church of England, or dissenters *from* it’? This writer has affirmed that the ambiguous and indeterminate name contains a fallacy; and in proof of this assertion, he adds, that ‘*in the ordinary sense and application of that term*’ (dissenter), ‘the Wesleyan Methodists are not dissenters.’ But where is the fallacy? A *fallacy in a name* must consist simply in its being false in any given application. The term dissenter is perfectly clear and limited and unambiguous in itself. It merely expresses a negative in relation to something understood. It does not define the degree, nor the particular point of disagreement. It does not pretend to state the reasons for differing from the supposed proposition; it does not say what kind of a dissenter he is, but merely that he does not agree to something implied and understood. Well then, where is the fallacy? The writer affirms a fallacy, but does not attempt to point it out. He merely alleges that the Wesleyans are not dissenters *in the ordinary sense of that term*. Granted: but the term is not necessarily limited to the sects that are usually called dissenters. Twenty other new sects might arise, and if they refused to conform to the church of England, they would be just as logically included under this universal negative, as any of those sects to which it is ordinarily applied. In fact, the term is clearly comprehensive of every party and every person who is not *bona fide* a churchman. The term dissenter applies to a quaker, a presbyterian, an independent, an antipædobaptist, a Swedenborgian, a Plymouth brother, and everybody else who, being a protestant in his religious opinions and practice, differs from the church of England. Wherein, then, consists the fallacy in this name, this hated, ambiguous word, *dissenter*? The learned author of the tract has failed, indeed he has not attempted, to show. He could not do it. He has merely stated that, *in its*

ordinary application, it does not belong to Wesleyan methodists. They are neither dissenters from the church, because, observe, they are not *such* dissenters from the church as some other people, nor are they schismatics in the church. This is very much like saying—they are neither out of the church of England nor in it. Their situation is like Mahomet's tomb; it is neither in heaven nor on earth, but somewhere between the two. But the thing is impossible. They are either churchmen or dissenters. We should rather suspect that the clerical writers who have enforced the proposition, which this author professes to prove fallacious, are logicians enough to detect *his* fallacies, his attempt to obscure the proposition, and his retreat, equally perilous and presumptuous, into the assumption of a new and extraordinary visitation of God, which we have before exposed; and they will certainly not fail to insist upon the proposition, and to make it ring in the ears of the Methodists, till they take one alternative or the other, '*you are either schismatics in the church of England, or dissenters from it.*' Your pretence to a special visitation and work of God, distinct from the New Testament, as your authority, is open rebellion against Christ and his apostles. It is a blasphemy for which you deserve stoning, unless you repent. And your own tracts will now be swift witnesses against you, that you are, all of you, either in the one or the other of those positions which you have denied.' Here, for instance, is one whole tract (No. 4) devoted to the proof that *Wesleyan ministers are true ministers of Christ*. But how does the writer prove it? By showing that they possess scriptural qualifications, and then by openly denying and setting aside the doctrine of the church of England, that there are three orders of clergy in the church of Christ; next, by asserting the validity of ordination by presbyters, to the denial of the necessity, at least, of episcopal ordination, and by repudiating with scorn the dogma of apostolical succession. Excellent! But what inference follows? This is literally dissenterism. The man who asserts that there are not, by divine institution, three orders in the ministry of the church of Christ, is A DISSENTER from the church of England. The man who denies or refuses assent to the proposition, that episcopal ordination is essential to the right and orderly ministration of the word and ordinances, IS A DISSENTER, because in this he differs from the church of England. He may not be an independent, a baptist, a unitarian dissenter; but he is, to all intents and purposes, *a dissenter after his own fashion*. It is mere dishonesty, shuffling, cowardice, unmanly evasion, to deny that he is a dissenter. No clearer proof could be supplied of dissenterism than is contained in these tracts, and yet it is

affirmed that '*Wesleyans are neither schismatics in the church, nor dissenters from it.*' They set up a distinct community; they separate from the parish church; they defend the validity of presbyterian ordination; they prefer their own system of church discipline to any other; they ridicule the notion of apostolical succession; they celebrate the simple rites of Christianity according to their own notions of apostolic precedent; they disown baptismal regeneration, and abolish the rite of confirmation; they repudiate the divine authority of diocesan episcopacy, assert the parity of all true ministers of Christ, employ lay preachers, and have practically preferred a voluntary system of church-support to a state-establishment; they have licensed their places of worship and their ministers, as not of the church by law established; they teach their people nonconformity to the establishment, and conformity to the laws of conference, and then they have the *ineffable modesty*, the *Christian frankness and simplicity*, to stand forth before the world with this announcement, 'We are neither schismatics in the church, nor dissenters from it, but just Wesleyan methodists, who claim as authority for our system, *an extraordinary visitation and work of God*; therefore touch us not, judge us not. You will be guilty of a fallacy if you call us dissenters of any sort; and you will be chargeable with falsehood if you describe us as schismatics in the church.'

The Wesleyan body may plead that they are not dissenters, because they evince no hostility to the church, thinking it unseemly to make war upon such near neighbours; yet, in this respect, many others who do not shrink from the name of dissenter are like them; and it does not follow, that to be a dissenter a man must maintain controversy, and evince an uncharitable spirit. But the fact, now obvious to all the world, is, that these tracts, published in the name of the body, do make open war upon *church-of-England principles*. The Puseyite sect or party, now by far the most numerous and powerful, have, in point of numbers and consistency, a just right to consider themselves as the church of England. Their opinions and interpretations are most in conformity with the entire system. Now the Wesleyan tracts, although asserting that they *will not be an attack upon any body of Christians*, are a direct attack upon these Puseyite clergy. Nor is this all. They contain denials, as we have already shown, of several cherished and unquestionable principles, maintained alike by all the formularies and all the clergy of the church of England. The body of Wesleyan Methodists are therefore now written down by their own pen, **DISSENTERS**. They may deny and reclaim as loudly and as much as they please: they have both verbally and practically

defended dissent, both from church-of-England Puseyism and church-of-England evangelism and episcopacy; and their pretended approbation of state alliance will go for nothing while they practise voluntaryism, and reject all the gracious overtures and wooing entreaties to merge their connexion in the establishment. They are *dissenters* by their own showing; and all attempts to induce them to return to the diocesan fold will be unavailing.

Mr. Hodgson has addressed to them a very temperate, very kind, and yet cutting appeal. And, if at least, they really loved the church system more than their own anomalous position, and believed that system strictly apostolic, they would renounce the pretence of an extraordinary visitation and work of God, and at once fall into the ranks of the hierarchy. But they will not do this. They never have for a moment seriously entertained the idea. They intend to remain Wesleyan Methodists—that is, dissenters, both theoretically and practically, until the millennium, or till there shall be another *extraordinary visitation and work of God*. The clergy who choose to attack them, upon the ground of their pretended approbation of the church of England, have had, and will still have, the better side of the argument. It must be unjustifiable to continue a separation which alleges no grounds of disagreement upon either principle or practice. The law of Christian union is violated by such a separation, and pronounces it a schismatical separation. The Wesleyan who can find nothing unscriptural, but all the contrary, in the system of the established church, ought to break through all his early association, and show that the name of Jesus Christ and his apostles has more authority with him than the name and opinions of John Wesley. The man who objects to church principles, and conscientiously practises others, is a dissenter.

It is to be expected that the assailants of Methodism from the side of the church will be increasingly urgent and increasingly successful. We have seen nothing in these tracts which is adapted to counteract the inroads of church-of-England zeal. Certainly, the attempt to defend themselves from the charge of schism or of dissent is a conspicuous failure. A more complete piece of sophistry and special pleading has rarely seen the light. It aspires to be equally learned, critical, and logical, and is altogether one of the least clear, and most inefficient of the series. The writers are, no doubt, able men in their way, and devoted admirers of Wesleyan Methodism; but they have egregiously committed themselves in supposing that they were called to write controversial tracts for the times. There may be fifty other things which they may do with ability and success, but their

vocation is evidently not in the controversial line. We do not perceive how they will ever again venture with seriousness to proclaim their adherence to the church of England, after the exposition of their opinions which these tracts supply. Every Puseyite may point to the Tract No. 3, entitled, 'Apostolical Succession,' and say, have you not denounced the principles of the church? Every evangelical clergyman may point to the Tract No. 4, entitled, 'Wesleyan ministers true ministers of Christ,' and say, have you not written against the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons? Is not the whole conference committed to a species of dissent? Fie upon you! You are endeavouring to write down our church, as much as any dissenters in the land, and you are as determined in your separation, and as ready to defend it by argument, as any sectarian. You are as clearly guilty of setting up a peculiar church-system as any of the sects, and you claim as full a measure of divine authority for your doctrine, discipline, and ministry, as ourselves. You affirm as full a validity in your administration of sacraments as we do in ours. And yet you have the effrontery to tell us and all the world, that you are *neither schismatics in the church, nor dissenters from it*. Now the only difference we can discern between you and others, is in the frankness with which others admit their dissent, and the flattery, equivocation, and pretended agreement with which you palliate yours. But, henceforth, your dissent is branded upon you, absolutely burnt in by your own hands. Every churchman will view you, cannot but view you, in spite of your sophistical argumentation, mere downright dissenters from church-of-England principles.

For our own parts we cannot but hail with satisfaction this authorized movement of the connexion. Though we deem it a very awkward and perilous thing for a whole body or denomination to engage in controversy, yet the very anomalous situation which methodism has long occupied, which is frankly admitted in these tracts, renders the effort now making to ascertain the real position of this important and useful society of Christians, highly desirable. We trust the series of Tracts will be continued, and that they will afford, from head quarters, a complete development of Methodism, and point out fully its hostility to modern churchism. The position taken by the Tracts, though accompanied with some serious trips, will prove serviceable to the grand principles of the reformation, and may materially contribute to reinforce the band of Christian advocates, who are gathering from all sides to withstand the common enemy. In this service we hail the volunteered, though somewhat limping assistance of Methodism. It will improve as it advances by its

arguments against Puseyism. It will honour itself, and assist the common cause, by asserting and arguing out the great protestant principle—the Bible, the Bible only! But it must either be content henceforth to wear the common badge of dissenterism, or its banner must exhibit a Wesley-face represented as a Janus, with one side wistfully looking up at a *mitre*, but the other wearing a presbyterian cap. We confidently predict that the connexion can no longer carry a double-faced standard, nor display an equivocal motto. Reluctant as the men may be to assume the position of hostility to churchism, yet they have at length been driven to it by ‘intolerant and unscrupulous assailants,’ and by the defections that have taken place. The Rubicon is now passed by the chiefs, and the dread of being called dissenters must give place to that zeal for the gospel and deference to the word of God, which unquestionably pervade the body. If the connexion could but once be brought to realize the position which they obviously do occupy; could they alike resolve to cast off their false shame and their worldly policy, to open their eyes to their own verbal and practical condemnation of the church—a church to which they show no deference but on paper, and from which they can expect to receive no quarter—could they, in one word, but be brought to confess the honest truth, and submit to be called Methodist dissenters, which they really are, they would then secure the respect of all other denominations, as men of clear and unequivocal principle; they would escape from all the embarrassing nets which they are continually spreading for their own feet, and go forth against Puseyism and churchism with all their fatal corruptions, ‘fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.’ But at present, their banner, if they consider themselves as having one, must be an *enigma*, the attempt to expound which has confounded and overthrown the very *Œdipus* of the party.

Art. VI. *Russia and the Russians in 1842.* By J. G. Kohl, Esq.
Vol. II. London: Colburn.

WE lose no time in introducing the second volume of this work to our readers. Its general character, both as it respects the value and the interest of the information which it contains, closely resembles that of its predecessor, and together they constitute a work which will render the English public more familiar with the character, institutions, social condition, and industrial habits of the Russian people than anything previously within

their reach. The comparatively recent development and rapid growth of Russian power, the vast extent of the empire, the multifarious character of its tribes, its warlike tendencies and obvious spirit of aggression, the part it has already acted in European politics, and the influence it is destined to exert over the councils and destinies of its neighbours,—all combine to fix upon this Northern Colossus the attentive eye of Europe, and to attach immense importance to a right estimate of the character of its people and the policy of its rulers. These considerations have led us to peruse M. Kohl's work with more than ordinary interest, and we shall be glad to find that it obtains—as it undoubtedly will—extensive circulation amongst our countrymen.

The present volume is divided into thirteen chapters, each of which contains much information that will be novel to the English reader. The first, entitled *Arts, Manufactures, Industry*, ranges over a variety of subjects of considerable importance and interest. By means of its situation and privileges, Petersburg monopolizes nearly the whole of the foreign trade of the empire, being 'almost the only port from which exclusively all Russia is supplied with jewellery, watches, clothing, wines, woollens, silks, cottons,' &c. This trade is in the hands of foreigners, who have accumulated in the capital vast stores of the productions of Western Europe. Petersburg is, in fact, the grand magazine whence other parts of the empire obtain their supply of foreign manufactures.

'Petersburg is the head-quarters of a most remarkable trade in productions of art, carried on by foreigners, and extending from town to town to the remotest places of the empire, to Charkoff, Woronesch, Astrachan, Tobolsk, and Kaluga; for which they have founded a distinct little colony in almost every town in Russia, establishing themselves in general in the main street of each.

'These provincial colonies of foreign artists, artisans, and dealers in productions of the arts, planted all over the empire, that is, throughout one-half of Europe and one-half of Asia, are a phenomenon well worthy of the attention of every traveller. By means of the commodities in which they deal, these persons acquire peculiar consequence and an extensive sphere of action; they promote the cause of civilization not merely as tradesmen, but in many other ways; they are admitted into companies which among us would be deemed far above them, and, as mere watchmakers, tailors, jewellers, or woollen-drapers, they frequently possess an influence and an importance not to be derived from their businesses alone. As they all resemble one another in the most striking manner, even in the minutest traits and peculiarities; since not only the different branches of this inland trade in the productions of the arts are separated in the same way, and the shops are everywhere arranged in precisely the same manner; such and such commo-

ditities always accompanying such and such others; but the same kind of persons are always found with the same goods, and these persons are universally of the same nation, have experienced the same fortunes in life, display the same virtues, and contract the same vices abroad: it may be worth while to collect the observations we have made upon this foreign industry in Petersburg, as they will serve at the same time to characterize the innumerable colonies in the other parts of the empire.'—pp. 2, 3.

Passing over a variety of topics we come to the following, in which our author's account of the gains of literature, and the proficiency attained in the typographical art, will probably surprise many of our readers. A vast portion of the Russian empire is yet in a state of semi-barbarism, but the elements of civilization are afloat, and under the fostering patronage of successive emperors, have extended their influence with astonishing rapidity over the upper classes of society.

'Among the many things that interest the foreigner in Petersburg, the booksellers' shops are certainly not the least important. Germans, French, and Russians here offer to the public the newest as well as the oldest fruits of their literature. Among the Germans the oldest, and indeed now somewhat antiquated, firms are those of Brieff and Gräfe, from whose shops issued most of the German and French works printed in Russia. Among the French booksellers, Pluchard was formerly the most eminent; but of the Russian, Smirdin is decidedly the first. It is astonishing what a rich assortment Russian literature has already furnished him, and not less so the extraordinary elegance with which books are now printed in his office. Perhaps at no time were books printed in Russia so vilely, on such wretched paper, with such abominable type, and such an utter want of taste and accuracy, as was not long ago almost universally the case, and as it is still here and there, in Germany. Since the beginning of the present century, such an extraordinary improvement has taken place in Russian typography, that you now meet here with works which will bear comparison with those of other countries. In the ordinary course, all Russian books are printed on stout paper, and with remarkably large type; but there are also editions in twelves and sixteens, which for neatness leave nothing to be desired.

'The advantage accruing to Russian literature from this improvement in outward appearance is not trifling; the Russian books printed by Smirdin may now show themselves boldly in the boudoirs of ladies of distinction, along with the elegant productions of Paris and London; and the time is past when a Russian noble had but here and there a Russian book standing in the dust on the lowest shelves of his almost exclusively French library. Russian books now fill completely the cases allotted to them. Not only the extent of the stock of many a retail bookseller of Petersburg and Moscow, exceeding in some in-

stances 100,000 volumes, but also the high prices paid to favourite authors, show the extraordinary increase which has recently taken place in the sale of Russian books. The following facts may serve for a standard. There are Russian authors who have already acquired by their pen estates comprehending several square [German] miles. There are persons of consequence who are paid from 5000 to 7000 rubles merely for lending their names to a favourite journal, and there are periodicals which have not fewer than 20,000 subscribers. The most extensive modern work, upon which a great number of hands are busily engaged, is the great, voluminous, Russian National Encyclopædia, the contributors to which are paid 100, 200 rubles, and more, per sheet, so that a very great circulation must be calculated upon. Russian literature is now strong enough to counterbalance the French in Russia, if not even to outweigh it here and there in the highest circles.'—pp. 33, 34.

We leave the second chapter of this volume, the twenty-second of the work, entitled *The Table and Cookery*, to such of our readers as are interested in culinary matters, and pass on to the next, which treats on the more important subject of education. Every spring witnesses the importation of a large number of Swiss, French, English, and German young ladies, who 'are destined to perform the functions of priestesses of Minerva in Russia, and to kindle and keep alive the fire of civilization in that country.' The number of governesses and private tutors in Petersburg is stated to be about six thousand, and the salaries paid them are considerable. On this latter point Kohl furnishes the following information:—

'The salaries which the Russians pay to private tutors are very high; they run in general from three to four thousand rubles, but some rise to six and even to ten thousand, especially when they wish to entice a person into inclement Siberia, or some other remote province. In general, when the engagement expires, an annuity is settled upon the teacher, or, what now begins to be more common, a round sum of from thirty to fifty thousand rubles is paid down to him at once. Even the French governesses receive salaries equal to those of professors in Germany; and they have rather risen than fallen, on account of the sparingness with which Russian passports are now granted. Such is the increasing demand for instructors, that extraordinary sums are paid even to natives.'—p. 74.

The nursemaids for young children, we are informed, are invariably English, who are reputed, much to their honour, to excel in the kindness and attention which such a post requires.

The Russian government, ever since the time of Peter the Great, has been distinguished by a zealous patronage of education. Academies, universities, gymnasiums, and popular schools

have sprung up, as if by magic, in all parts of the empire. So uniform has been the policy of the rulers, that the Russian schoolmaster has invariably followed the steps of the Russian soldier.

‘In every country added by their arms to the empire, the Russians immediately make it their business to found schools after their fashion, aware, like the Romans, how mighty are the bonds in which one and the same language and education bind the members of a state together. Thus they have introduced their schools among the Tatars, the Fins, the Moldavians, and many other nations; thus they have even carried their method of instruction beyond the Caucasus, and applied it to the Armenians and the Grusinians; thus they have recently suppressed throughout all Poland the old schools of the country, and established others upon their own plan; thus, in the Baltic provinces, they have even entered the lists against the German scholastic system, though they originally took it for their model, and are striving to breathe into it their own spirit; and thus they are everywhere assiduously endeavouring, by means of their schools, to annihilate everything foreign, to frame every part of the state after their fashion, to russify it, after setting themselves up, from the frontiers of Germany to the extremity of Mongolia, to China and Japan, for champions of European culture modified in the Russian manner, and drawing numerous tribes and nations into the fermentative process of their civilization.’—pp. 80, 81.

From this state of things it might reasonably be concluded that the great bulk of the people must have made considerable progress in the elements of useful knowledge. There are, however, some drawbacks which must be taken into account before a correct estimate of their condition can be formed. There is no European nation, according to our author, which attaches such importance to mere externals, and is so little capable of appreciating the more substantial but less visible acquisitions of real science. This preference of the outward to the inward is apparent in their courts of justice, in their army, and even in their trades and commerce, ‘where all the labels and the outside of their goods are elegant, and the arrangement brilliant, but the goods themselves worthless.’ The same fact is observable in their collegiate institutions, the buildings, regulations, and examinations of which are admirable, while a discerning eye is not long in detecting a lamentable deficiency of all that constitutes the real value of education.

Next to the university, the *Pedagogic Institution*, the object of which is to train teachers, is most deserving of attention. It was founded in 1832, after the Polish revolution, enjoys almost all the rights and privileges of the university, is supported by the crown, and costs annually not less than 250,000 rubles.

‘The institutions for the education of the female sex in Petersburg are almost as numerous as those for the male. At the head of them all must be placed the great institution of Smolna, in the convent of that name, to which we have already adverted. In this remarkable institution not fewer than eight hundred young females are brought up, taught French and German, and instructed in the fine arts and sciences. Most of them are of noble birth. The commoners occupy a different building, and have a different dress, different fare, and different attendance. This institution, together with those founded on the same principle in various government towns for the daughters of the inferior and poorer nobility, nearly correspond with the schools of cadets for the sons. When parents know not what to do at home with sons, they send them to the cadets, and daughters in like manner to the institutions, when they cannot educate them at home.

‘All the wealthy Russians prefer domestic education for girls. The directresses of those institutions, and particularly of the Petersburg institution abovementioned, are commonly ladies of high rank, widows of generals, &c., for whom a suitable provision is made by the gift of such an office. They are mostly noble Livonian ladies of the German nation, and highly accomplished. The consequence of these ladies is not small, and they, who with us would be merely teachers, are here nearly equal in rank and importance to the governors of provinces.

‘The institution of Smolna costs upward of 700,000 rubles per annum; thus nearly 1000 rubles are expended on the education of each of the young ladies—a sum for which something brilliant might be expected. It is true that whatever has been polished here shines not a little; but it is mere moonshine, light without warmth, which indeed possesses a certain charm, but is destitute of the vivifying, fructifying power so peculiarly desirable in this case, since most of these young ladies are destined as teachers and governesses, to sow the seeds of knowledge in other minds.

‘For the rest, the Smolna Institution is perhaps unique, for nowhere else, we presume, are so many young buds of nobility, so much warm youthful blood circulating in female forms, to be found under one roof. The interesting stories occasionally communicated to the stranger out of the annals of the institution, would furnish matter for a separate book. Amazonian wars, ladies’ revolutions, seraglio-intrigues—novels upon novels might be spun out of them. It is a pity that the young ladies appear but very seldom in public. They are kept shut up almost as close as in a convent. Only now and then, on high festivals, a long train of imperial carriages and six is seen drawing out of the gates of the convent, to give the pretty greenhouse-flowers an airing.’—pp. 92, 93.

The Russian servants constitute a numerous class, whose habits and condition reflect no very creditable light on the general state of the community. Personal slavery exists to a vast extent, and all the evils usually attendant on it follow in its train.

The great body of the people are in the condition of serfs, and are divided by their lords into two classes,—those who cultivate the land, and those (termed court-yard people) who are selected as domestic servants. Of the latter class, M. Kohl remarks:—

‘ These court-yard people have, as such, various immunities; they are exempted from agricultural labour and from military service. As they fare no better at court than at home, must find their own bread and kwas, and live for the rest upon the leavings of the lord’s table, and as most of them are not supplied with any other clothes than what they wore on the paternal dunghill, such attendants cost, of course, but little, and the lords therefore take whole troops of stable-boys, stove-heaters, scullions, lamp-lighters, domestic couriers, house-maids, and table-deckers. These genuine old Russian retainers, who, with their bast shoes and sheep-skin pelisses, form a remarkable contrast with the palaces where they live with their lords, and where they occasionally sleep on the bench of the kitchen stove, or on the chairs or the floor of the rooms, without bed or chamber of their own, are found in all the country houses in the interior, and still seen also in many houses in Moscow and Petersburg, especially of the poorer sort. Many of these serfs who have been taken from the fields are employed in the performance of the more menial household duties; they are provided indeed with boots and a better kaftan, used for a time in the kitchen or stable, and then sent back again to the fields. In general, they continue not long in their new posts; and, upon the whole, they differ too little from the actual peasants to form a distinct class of society, and to separate themselves, under the name of servants, from the other serfs.’—pp. 95, 96.

A large section of the servants of Petersburg is composed of peasants and the younger sons of farmers, for whom the lords of the soil cannot find agricultural employment. These are dismissed to the capital to seek a livelihood for themselves, under an engagement to pay their lords a stipulated sum yearly. They are furnished with a passport to the following effect, and may be met with in the coffee-houses, manufactories, and private families of Petersburg:—

‘ I dismiss this, my *krepostnoi tschelwek* (bondman), Jephim, on condition of his paying a yearly *obrok* of sixty (seventy, eighty, or more) rubles, to be sent to me half yearly, with liberty to go to all the cities and villages in the Russian empire, to seek his livelihood in any way whatever for so or so many years, till I shall think fit to recal him to my estate N., where he is registered.’

The number of servants kept in first-rate Russian establishments is astonishingly great; and, as there is happily a growing preference for free persons, the wages paid are very high. One

circumstance pertaining to them, mentioned by our author, has surprised us, as it probably will most of our readers, for whose information we transcribe it:—

‘ If anything in Petersburg excites the astonishment of foreigners, it is the extraordinary fondness for reading now observable among the Russian servants. Most of the antechambers of Petersburg grandees, where part of the servants are constantly assembled, look like absolute reading-rooms, all of them being engaged with some book or other, with the exception of those who are playing at backgammon, the favourite game of the Russians, who take the same delight, and display the same skill in it, whether as sailors upon the ocean, as exiles in Siberia, as soldiers on the field of battle, or as domestics in the antechamber. It is no uncommon thing to find six or eight of them in different corners of the room, absorbed in their books; and if this sign of a growing desire of knowledge astonishes the foreigner, who expected to find here nothing but barbarism, sloth, and ignorance, he will be still more astonished if he takes the trouble to inquire the subjects of the works which they are reading. A translation of Bourrienne’s *Memoirs*, Karamsin’s *History of Russia*, Kruiłow’s *Fables*, Prince Odojewsky’s *Tales*, Bantysch Kamensky’s *History of Little Russia*, Polewoy’s *Sketch of Universal History*, a translation of the *Æneid*—such are the titles that present themselves to the inquirer. Enough is now written in Russia to make the diligent reader acquainted with everything new that is worth knowing, and the book-market and circulating libraries in Petersburg distribute it promptly among the people. In the provinces the case is different, and there you meet with real touching instances of literary propensities. I knew an old house-steward, who, in his leisure hours, had learned Kruiłow’s *Fables* by heart, and read Karamsin’s *History* six times, because he could not procure any other book. Another servant had studied a voluminous system of mathematics, geometry, and trigonometry, and likewise a complete system of algebra, and drawn most of the figures on scraps of paper. All that is written among us concerning Napoleon is immediately translated into Russian, and greedily devoured by all classes, but especially in the servants’ halls in Petersburg. When you examine the book-shelves of these people in their dark rooms, you are surprised to find what the activity of their inquisitive minds has led them to bring together. Part of a Bible lies beside a translation of the *Iliad*, and an *Asbuka* (A B C book) published by the Holy Synod by a work of Voltaire’s. The very passport of the Russian servants shews that in one branch of knowledge they surpass those of other countries, for, after the usual particulars concerning eyes, mouth, beard, &c., there comes this intimation, ‘ He speaks languages,’ and immediately afterwards, Russian, French, German, English, and Turkish, are specified.’—pp. 115—117.

The amusements of the capital are sketched with much vivacity and life in Chapter XXV., which is entitled, ‘ *The Butter-*

week.' Easter is the chief festival of the Greek-Russian church. It commences in the middle of the night before Easter Sunday, and is preceded by a seven weeks' fast, which again is introduced by eight days' feasting, called by the Russians, *Masslänitza*, Butter-week. This season of indulgence 'may be said to contain the quintessence of all the Russian festivities for the whole year. And with the exception of Easter week, there is no week in the year that affords a Petersburger so much earthly pleasure as this.' The amusement most popular amongst the Russians is that of the ice-hills, which are constructed by a narrow stage elevated about thirty or forty feet, with a small gallery at the top. To this there is an ascent on one side by wooden steps, and on the other, there is an inclined plane, very steep at first, but gradually sloping towards the ground. The surface of this plane, which is composed of the trunks of trees, is covered with square blocks of ice, over which water is occasionally poured, in order, by its freezing, to cement the blocks, and to increase the smoothness of the slope. The following is M. Kohl's account of the entertainment furnished by these novel constructions:—

'The barriers which bound their courses are always lined with a dense crowd of spectators, while the courses themselves exhibit no lack of actors. At the foot of the scaffold you find a number of men with small low sledges, without backs, which, while tendering the use of them, they almost thrust under the feet of passengers. The moment you give one of them an approving nod, he runs up the steps with you, and you arrange yourself on the narrow little sledge as well as you can. The conductor springs up behind, and away darts the sledge down the descent. The impetus which it receives from the steepness of the slope at first operates so powerfully, that you would fly nobody knows how far, if the end of the course were not strewed with sand, which diminishes the rapidity of the sledge, and totally stops its movement. The conductor has thick leather gloves on his hands, which he suffers to glide over the surface of the ice, giving a thrust now on one side, then on another, to guide the sledge and to correct little irregularities. About noon, when the concourse is very great, one sledge flies hissing after another. Petty accidents cannot always be avoided; serious ones rarely happen; and the former, while they cause but little vexation to a single individual, are extremely amusing to thousands. The sledge, laden with the corpulent wife of some Russian tradesman, shoots down the course somewhat more rapidly than that in which a slender *élégant* seats himself merely for experiment's sake. Highly comic scenes are often occurring, especially at the end of the course in the sand, where perhaps a young woman, who has made the trip for the first time in her life, and is half dead with fright, cannot pick herself up before a smart fellow, with outstretched legs, comes sailing down upon her, and thus you sometimes see a whole

knot of people and sledges tumbling about in the snow at once. The exhibition of equilibristic tricks during the descent is forbidden; and, on account of the danger attending the amusement, the police take care that none but the ordinary sledges and the appointed conductors shall be employed. Occasionally, however, daring fellows, who are not concerned about their necks, contrive to elude their vigilance, and to perform some trick or other. One will lie down at full length on the sledge, shut his eyes, and, with folded arms, plunge down the descent with as much indifference as if he were asleep. Another lies down head foremost, making a face at the spectators, and launches himself off as though tumbling over head and heels. Some even venture to skait down, and, flying like arrows to the end of the course, they are lost among the crowd long before the police can overtake them. Of course this is not a genteel amusement. With the exception of the ladies, however, who feel themselves above the fat Russian tradesmen's wives, everybody tries it for once in a way, particularly the English—but what on earth is there that they leave untried?—pp. 136—138.

The seven weeks' fast which follows the Butter-week, is, of course, a wearisome time to the Russians, who look forward to its termination with a full resolve to compensate themselves for the abstinence it has imposed. 'In the last days of the fast, expectation is excited,' we are informed, 'to the utmost. . . . People are completely tired and exhausted with the incessant kneeling, and the long church services. Many have not eaten a morsel for the last three days, and are half famished.' The churches are perambulated during the whole of Saturday evening, though the priests are not seen until midnight. This has given rise to a singular custom, which will excite the pious horror of some of our sticklers for ecclesiastical etiquette. It is somewhat instructive to observe, that in a church so deeply sunk in superstition as the Russian Greek church confessedly is, there should yet remain vestiges of primitive times which are unknown in the worship of our hierarchy. We commend to the serious attention of our church readers, if, indeed, we have such, M. Kohl's remarks towards the close of the following extract:—

'It is customary for one of the public to take upon himself the task of reading out of the gospels. For this purpose a desk, with a Bible, is placed in the middle of the church. Persons of the lowest class, who can spell Slavonic, stand forth, and with a burning taper in their hands, light themselves to read out of the Bible to all those who are willing to listen, till others offer to relieve them. I must confess that, with the exception of the delightful singing, this reading on Easter-eve was to me the most impressive and edifying practice of the Russian church.

'When, on Easter-eve, 1837, I made my tour of the churches of the capital, I found in the Spass-Preobrajenskoi church an old scarred

soldier in his gray frock standing at the desk, with his wax taper in his hand, reading the gospel aloud. Around him were gathered a great number of children, who, with eyes steadfastly fixed upon him, listened with folded hands as devoutly as the adults. In the Panteleimon church I found an equally pious circle around the solitary wax taper of a long-bearded venerable old man, who took great pains to rehearse, with feeble and tremulous voice, but with great earnestness and devotion, the history of the sufferings of the Redeemer. Old women, young damsels, children, and youths, were standing in the most attentive groups around him, and neither he nor they took the least notice of the numbers continually going to and fro to kiss the corpse.

‘I could not tire of witnessing these picturesque scenes, and found them in all the churches addressing themselves with equal force to the heart. It is a pity that the priests do not oftener relinquish the book, and suffer the word of God to be dispensed by the simple members of the congregation; true piety could only be a gainer by it. All the priests without exception attain, by the daily repetition of the same things, a great mechanical fluency, with which they then perform divine service; and the little in that service which might touch their own hearts is recited with such indifference as to lose all its effect. On the other hand, the interest of the voluntary reader in the subject which he is reading of is manifest and unaffected; and the sentiments and precepts which he recites go immediately to the heart since they come immediately from the heart. Even the defects of the reader, so far from disturbing devotion, serve on the contrary to promote it. When he pauses at a word, moves his eye and his light closer to the book, his auditors listen with increased attention; and when the right word is pronounced with stronger emphasis, it never fails to make a proportionate impression.’—pp. 170—172.

As midnight approaches, the churches gradually become crowded. Mass is read faintly and slowly, till the critical moment arrives, when the scene instantly assumes a totally different character. ‘The fast is banished as if by magic, and Easter Sunday suddenly bursts forth from amidst the darkness like an Apollo.’ M. Kohl tells us that it would be difficult to relate all the extraordinary things which are to be heard and seen as soon as the hour of midnight arrives. We can make room only for his account of one of these national customs, which will appear sufficiently singular to our reserved and prudent countrymen.

‘In the first place, all the members of a family without exception kiss one another. Supposing a family consists of ten members only, this gives ninety kisses apiece for that family alone. Besides this, all acquaintances, the first time they meet in the Easter-week, kiss each other. This designation comprehends not merely intimate acquaintances: persons to whom you have spoken but a few times would be grievously offended, if, on first meeting, you hesitated to give and

receive the kiss and the cordial embrace. 'The devil fetch thee, Maxim!' I once heard an old woman call out to a young fellow; 'canst thou not say to me, 'Christ is risen,' and kiss me?'

'If we assume, then, that every person in Petersburg has upon an average a hundred near and distant acquaintances, which is a very moderate calculation, the result for the 500,000 inhabitants of Petersburg alone is a total of fifty million Easter embraces. But consider what a prodigious business is done by certain individuals in this article. In the army, every general of a corps (of 60,000 men) must kiss all its officers, and in like manner, every commander of a regiment, all the officers of that regiment, and a select number of the privates to boot. The captain kisses individually all the soldiers of his company, who are mustered for this special purpose. The same system prevails in the civil department: the head must kiss all his underlings, who hasten to visit him on Easter Sunday morning in their state uniforms. Hence, owing to the numerous establishments of the public offices, the chief may often need no small quantity of lip-salve during the following days; for, as far as I have observed, all these kisses are not such make-believe, superficial ones as actors, for instance, give one another, but downright hearty smacks. Even a subordinate person has plenty to do in this way; for he has often a dozen grades of immediate and mediate superiors; but, as for these latter, from whom long trains of subordinates are incessantly departing, they have scarcely time to breathe. Of course, on this, as on every other occasion, the most duties and the most business devolve upon the emperor. Only consider his large family, his prodigious court and establishment, the numberless visitors that he receives on Easter Sunday morning, all the people of distinction with whom he is personally acquainted, and whom he honours with a bow when he casually meets them! But this is not all. The meanest sentry in his palace, whom he passes at Easter, he salutes with a kiss and '*Christohs woskress*.' Nay, upon the Parade on Easter Sunday, he kisses the whole assembled corps of officers, and a not inconsiderable number of the privates, who, selected for the purpose, step out of the ranks.

'All these kisses, being given heartily and cordially, amidst laughing and shaking of hands, as though people had not met for a long time, and were expressing their mutual congratulations on seeing one another so brisk and so cheerful after a long period of severe affliction, it may easily be conceived what joyous scenes fill the streets and the houses. '*Christohs woskress, Jéfim Stepánowitsch!*' (Christ is risen, Eupheme Stephen's son!) cries one bushy beard to another, while yet at some distance—'*Woistwenno woskress*' (he is risen, indeed). Grasping each other's hand, they kiss, and *padjóm w'kabak, brat!* (let us have something to drink, brother!) is the next thing, and away they go to the public-house for some brandy, which is now poured forth as profusely as water by the limpid springs in Mohammed's paradise. Among the higher classes, much the same thing occurs, only with them it is '*Allons déjeuner*.'—pp. 179—181.

Unhappily, there are other and more criminal habits prevalent during Easter. Intoxication is one of these, which, however, from some peculiarity in the temperament of the Russians, is productive of less evil amongst them than amongst most other people. The following is our author's account of this matter:—

‘That all the Easter scenes are not of this mild and cheerful complexion may be inferred from the assiduous homage paid to that pernicious beverage, so egregiously miscalled ‘water of life.’ Intoxication at Easter is universally excused; and it is so general at this festival, that, in Little Russia in particular, you find villages where the whole population is drunk. Hence arise, of course, many disorders: serfs run away from their masters, and servants are dismissed for misbehaviour, at Easter. Foreigners especially are put to their shifts at this season, and are frequently left to wait upon themselves at Easter, when no Russian can be kept under control. Among any other nation, however, amidst such a general frenzy, a hundred thousand times more scandals and offences would be committed. A Russian Easter, enacted in England or Italy, would be a real scene of bloodshed and murder; and it is entirely owing to the Russian national character, to the peculiar good-nature and peaceable disposition of these people, that upon the whole far more comical and merely repulsive than sanguinary incidents occur at this season. In illustration of this point, I subjoin a few of my street observations.

‘In the capital of the Ukraine, I once walked out, on Easter Monday, beyond the gate, through which numbers of people, men and women, were pouring in, all of them tottering and intoxicated; for in the country brandy is cheaper than in the towns, where the sale of spirits is a monopoly. As I stopped and looked after them, shaking my head, and astonished at the sight, the last of these merrymakers reeled up to me, and said, taking off his hat, ‘Drunken people, sir! It is a holiday; excuse them—pray excuse them! Be not angry, sir, I beseech you. Be not angry, sir; God has given us a holiday to-day.’ Nothing would serve him, but I must give him my hand, and promise to forgive what I, a foreigner, had no power whatever to punish.

‘In another town I once saw, during the Easter diversions, a drunken man take off his hat in the same manner in the public place before the governor, fall upon his knees, and seize his hand, saying, ‘Ah! I am drunk, your excellency! it is a holiday to-day; let me be flogged—I have drunk too much; I beseech your excellency to let me be punished:’ and the governor could not get away till he had given the man a sharp reprimand.’—pp. 182, 183.

We need not repeat the opinion already expressed on this work. The extracts we have given will speak for themselves, and the volume from which they are taken is fully entitled to share in the commendation we bestowed last month on its predecessor.

Art. VII. *Tracts published by the National Complete Suffrage Union.*

1. *The Suffrage: An Appeal to the Middle Classes by one of themselves.*
2. *Minutes of the Conference of the Middle and Working Classes, held at Birmingham, April 1842, and Appendix of Documents, List of Delegates, &c.*
3. *Report of the Proceedings of the Conference, &c. &c.*
4. *The National Complete Suffrage Union to their Country.*
5. *Rules and Objects of the National Complete Suffrage Union.*
6. *Circulars issued to Associations by the Council of the National Complete Suffrage Union.*

IN our Number for April last, we took a hasty glance at Chartism. From amidst the rubbish of ignorant dogmatism in which furious demagogues had buried them, we endeavoured to pick out the great political principles which that ill-omened term is used to represent, and to submit them, in their unconcealed and unadorned dignity, to the notice of our readers. We hold ourselves under obligation, in the discharge of our duty as journalists, to deal fearlessly and impartially with every topic which stands out in prominent relief before the public eye; and we wish to bear in mind that we may bring equal guilt upon ourselves by neglecting misapprehended and despised worth, as by lending our sanction to showy and fashionable worthlessness. We should but ill answer it to our own conscience, in a searching and solemn review of our labours, if we could be justly charged with going out of our way to avoid subjects which fairly appeal to us for judgment, lest by a calm and patient examination of them we might awaken suspicion, or with surrendering our reason to clamour, from an unmanly fear of pronouncing a decided opinion at variance with the tastes, feelings, and habits of surrounding friends. We are now about to call attention to a kindred topic, and as a fitting introduction to it, we request leave to make a few general and preliminary observations.

It is always of some importance, as a means to brace up our minds to serious investigation when unwelcome subjects obtrude themselves upon our notice, to reflect that, in reference to truth, in every department, we are under a law of probation. Reflection exercised upon those materials which experience has put within our reach, teaches us to recognise and to admire that principle of providential administration which connects the perception of truth with integrity of purpose and honesty of heart. Hitherto we have had no important revelation, natural or supernal, the mere enunciation of which has insured its imme-

diate triumph. Never, so far as we know, has the introduction into society of a new moral element been compassed by virtue of its alliance with adventitious advantages. 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.' The powers to which human hearts are bidden to do homage, borrow no aid from superficial lustre and outward pomp; and He who 'knows what is in man,' has taken care that the trappings of truth shall not be of such sort as to win that attention which herself would fail to command. It would even appear that, just in proportion to the real importance and dignity of a subject, and to the extent of that power which it is eventually destined to wield over human minds, are usually found the meanness of its earthly origin, the lowliness of its early circumstances, and the repulsive vulgarity and glaring misbehaviour of its first adherents. The world was slow enough to believe that the great mystery of man's redemption lay wrapped up in the unlettered minds and rude speech of a little knot of Jewish fishermen and tax-gatherers. His would have been a prophetic eye of no ordinary range and power, who could have predicted of the monk at Erfurth, engaged in sweeping the apartments and tilling the garden of the then obscure monastic establishment, that cradled in that man's soul there slept, at that moment, a power which, when subsequently called into action, would make the nations of Europe bow, as the pine forests bend to the northern blast, and would turn the world's history into a new channel.

The primary and essential maxims constituting the substantial masonry and solid timbers of that temple of wisdom, which age after age is employed in constructing, with toil so vast, and with progress so slow and imperceptible, are not found in the haunts of refinement and cultivation. We have to go for them to the desolate wastes of society. There, in rude, unshapen masses, amid scenes the most uninviting, and as if consigned to eternal neglect, we discover, in the greatest abundance, the materials which unwearied thought must hew into shape, and stern moral courage must bring to their appropriate and final position in the edifice. It is somewhere remarked by Dr. Vaughan, that virtue commonly ascends from the multitude to their rulers—from the broad basement to the elevated peaks of the social world. A similar remark may be made of practical truth, which is, indeed, the matrix of virtue. The elemental stuff which, in its concrete state, we call axioms, is diffused in unsuspected abundance through the lower strata of mankind. It may be extracted in larger quantities, and often in more unalloyed condition, from common notions and vulgar proverbs, than from fashionable sentiments. Man, when he has nothing external on which to value himself,

has, in most cases, a keen eye to what befits *man*. The conclusions at which he arrives are, for the most part, pitched upon in consequence of their obvious congruity with the real wants of human nature. Artificial modes of existence call for moral inventions to harmonize with them—principles framed with an especial view to the novelty of the position. Conventional life gives being to conventional maxims, and in politics equally as in morals, substantial truth is overlaid with the expedients of refinement. Hence it invariably happens, that all great and permanent changes work from beneath—that the germs of those laws, upon the ultimate recognition of which social happiness is contingent, quicken first in the minds of the untutored poor, and that the soundest principles emerge from that unlooked for quarter, first to provoke the derision, and eventually to compel the homage of the great and good of every class.

It may be further worthy of remark, that the earliest progress of important truths to universal empire, is generally marked by circumstantial characteristics, which subject such truths, and those to whom they appeal for reception and obedience, to the severest test. Novelties of any 'mark and likelihood,' are sure, upon their first appearance, to collect about them votaries of every shade of character. The vile as well as the virtuous—the selfish as readily as the disinterested—minds which are ever prowling about in quest of excitement—affections worn into premature exhaustion by excess—knavery which detects a new and hopeful chance of turning credulity to account—vanity which has sought distinction to no purpose in the beaten paths of life—enthusiasm, whose attachment to its new idol overleaps all the fences of decency in its endeavours to exalt it, all gather about the stranger in confused and tumultuous crowds. It would seem as though this were God's provision for smothering the *lulus naturæ* of the moral world. So perverse and wayward is the human mind, that it is impossible to predict what would be the ultimate destiny of the most hideous monstrosities, were they only set off by respectability and consistency in their early worshippers. If the grave and serious alone, if the well-intentioned only, and the ingenuous, were to bend the knee at the shrine of newly-proclaimed divinities, one cannot foresee what would be the duration of their reign. Whereas, happily, according to the present law, the grotesque inanities are soon defiled by their own votaries, and having no vital principle, rot beneath the heap of infamy in which their followers contrive to carry them. But if error has to go through this ordeal, so has truth, and truth only can abide and survive it. The absurdities and misconduct of its professed admirers will, in no case, be wanting to bring it into bad odour;

its reputation will be tainted, its name will be associated with everything criminal and base. Now, as in former times—in this, as in another and a more sacred instance—the prudes and pharisees of this world will start back with horror at its approach, and say, ‘It is a devil.’ For this is no new feature of earth’s history. The precious is here, oftentimes, in close juxta-position with the vile; the tares and the wheat, in more senses than one, grow together, and, distinct as they are in nature, can only be discriminated by close investigation carried on under the direction of honest purpose. There are other things spoken to us ‘in parables’ besides religion, and in other spheres a necessity for that law which ordains ‘By hearing ye shall hear, and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive.’

We have ventured upon the preceding train of thought with a view to caution our readers against the common danger of avoiding subjects soliciting inquiry, simply because they have hitherto gained consideration only among the vulgar, or have presented themselves to notice clouded with the misdeeds of unprincipled men. Against the prevailing habit of dismissing from us every newly-discovered principle until the rulers have believed in it, Christian citizens are bound to be especially on their guard. That system of doctrine which now shines forth as emphatically ‘the light of the world,’ those principles of religious liberty which are the glory of modern times, and which even the statesmen of our empire are compelled, in theory, to recognise—all that is intrinsically good and permanently vital among us, found their first home in the lowly vales of society, and have passed through successive stages of contempt, obloquy, opposition, and scorn. It becomes not those who now reap the laurels and enjoy the fruits of other men’s patient endurance of reproach, to stand by in unconcern and witness truth hunted down by mere clamour, or consigned to cold neglect for the follies of its friends. ‘Fair play is a jewel,’—a jewel which ought to grace every Christian brow, and assuredly protestant dissenters should be the last men in the world to join in hooting at any doctrine, religious or political, which has not upon it the stamp of this world’s respectability. ‘Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.’

Representation, as the basis of civil government, is one of those principles the birth of which is concealed in obscurity. Whenever, or to whomsoever, it first occurred, it was a happy thought. Some daughter of Pharaoh, it may be, tended it in infancy, and reared into youth the power ordained in after days to shake into ruins the Egyptian supremacy of ‘divine right.’ Doubtless it grew into importance unobserved, and many failures, many dis-

asters, marked the trials of its young and inexperienced strength. It would be useless to our present purpose, even were it possible, to observe the successive unfoldings of its power, the gradual development of its inherent virtues; it is sufficient for us to know that it has established its empire in this our world, and is, every year, extending the boundaries of its dominion. It has compelled the assent, it has won the approval, of every man who lays the slightest claim to a reputation for intelligence. Poets have sung of it. Statesmen have lauded it. Philosophers have done it homage. National greatness has here and elsewhere grown up under its auspices. It is no longer a thing for reason to discuss, but for experience and sagacity to perfect. The question is no longer whether it ought to be, but how it *shall* be to best advantage? It has obtained for itself a footing which precludes dispute, and the only inquiry remaining is, how to turn its presence among us to most profitable account.

Representation is the only well-defined and tangible form hitherto discovered of the abstract truth, 'The people are the only legitimate source of political power,' or in other words, 'Government is made for man, and not man for government.' This truth, it is probable, has been floating, unformed, in the mind of society, in all ages. Dim and confused notions of it all men appear to have, and, under the sternest despotisms, occasionally to act upon. Like electric fluid it may, for the most part, have been latent, and its presence might have been plausibly denied, but for those occasional junctures of events when it has flashed forth in sudden insurrectionary explosions. The lightning of popular wrath has, in every clime under heaven, revealed, at one and the same time, the universal belief, and, when excited, the terrible energy of this abstract notion of the rights of man. Representation, however, is the only fixed form in which it has embodied itself. Herein the spiritual is seen passing into the practical. It is the outward reality in search of which society had long groped its way in darkness, conscious of want which incessantly craved for satisfaction. Its adaptation to meet the exigencies of the case, and to fulfil the demands of the primary truth to which we have adverted, carries with it a self-evidencing power. The theory of representation, therefore, has found few direct opponents. Equity and expediency unite to recommend it; and they who in practice violate its spirit, equally with those who are anxious to see it fairly developed, are proud to weave a garland for its head.

It may seem strange, but it is not more strange than true, that men can admire as an idea, what they despise as a fact. And yet, the doctrine of representation, to which most men willingly

yield assent, and which they are forward to praise as heaven-born, has, in all its attempts to embody itself in the civil institutions of this country, been called to maintain an incessant and arduous struggle with prejudice and contempt. Not only have those whose selfish interests stood opposed to the practical realization of this much lauded idea, bestrewn its path with obstacles, but even the sober, the educated, the religious, have dealt out to it unmeasured scorn. With ease the most unaccountable, they seem to forget that the eulogiums they have pronounced upon its character belong, not to the semblance of the thing, but to the thing itself—not to the name, but to the reality. Observe, now, the direction which all the outcry against the principles of what is now called ‘complete suffrage,’ takes. It is all levelled, most of it, we verily believe, in ignorance, at representation itself. Nothing more is meant, nothing more can be understood by complete suffrage, or by the principles of the charter, than that what is now only a theory assented to by all, shall be converted into a fact for the advantage of all; and that what our lawyers and statesmen have uniformly recognised as the genius of the English constitution, should be clothed with real authority, instead of being merely decked, as now, with an empty title to speculative homage.

If it be true, as all will be, and are, forward to admit, that legitimate government must be from the people, and that the proper method of arriving at it is by representation, it will be difficult, we imagine, to deny that the ideal involved is the *equal* representation of the *entire* people. Despotism is one thing, self-government is another. But despotism is not the less despotism when wielded by a class than when residing in the hands of a single individual. It matters not that some have delegated to others the power of ruling over all. They who delegated such power are bound to show valid grounds of authority for what they do. They must enjoy their privilege, either by divine right, or by the consent and appointment of the whole body of the governed. To one or other of these they must trace their authority, or they tacitly admit that it is founded on nothing better than usurpation. The class excluded is essentially a slave-class; the power which compels their submission, centre where it may, is an arbitrary and irresponsible power. If this be consistent with equity, unmixed despotism is equally so; and if that be true, then is the maxim false, that ‘the people are the only proper source of political power.’

The doctrine of ‘complete suffrage’ is substantially the doctrine of government based upon national representation. Every one of its principles turns out, upon inquiry, to be but an essential

property of that one idea. Parliament selected *by* a class, whether more or less numerous, is absolutism shared by many instead of engrossed by one. Parliament selected *from* a class, is not representation, even where the constituency is co-extensive with the nation; for although all may vote, all do not choose. Parliament inadequately responsible, may be representation for a brief period, but will speedily run into despotic power; it is not permanent representation, for it carries within itself the seeds of its own death. Parliament elected by a whole people, but composed of members chosen by grossly unequal numbers—here by a few hundreds, there by many thousands, is representation in appearance rather than in reality; for by it, it may happen that we get not at the mind of the nation, but at that of a small and manageable section of it. Lastly, parliament selected under the pressure of external constraint, is not representation, but misrepresentation; for votes, in such case, become the records, not of a people's will, but of a people's helplessness. Here, then, we have what are technically denominated the 'six points.' In fact, however, they all merge in one, and that one is real, as distinguished from nominal, representation. The essential principle involves, of necessity, the particulars. Terms may be objected to, machinery may be, in this or the other instance, regarded as inefficient; but he who intelligently embraces the doctrine of government by representation, as opposed to government by arbitrary power, must acknowledge the propriety of making it 'full, fair, and free,' and such an acknowledgment is a virtual acquiescence in all the points contended for, not, indeed, in letter, but in substance and spirit.

The full development of the doctrine of representation in this more elaborate, and, at first view, complex form, is by no means new, nor does it belong to the present century. In the last decade of the preceding one, it pushed itself into notice, and obtained for itself considerable celebrity. That it made rapid strides in popular affections may be gathered from the violence with which it was assailed. The course of the French revolution failing to imprint upon the hearts of the ruling classes the solemn burden which Providence had commissioned it to declare, namely, the certainty with which oppression draws down punishment, stimulated the passions which it was designed to awe. The alarm of the aristocracy prompted them to cruelty, and the state-church, in every parish of the empire, abetted their now furious tyranny. The crushing enginery of law was repaired, enlarged, put in motion, and brought to bear with overwhelming power upon the devoted heads of parliamentary reformers. The upper fountains of opinion poured forth in continuous streams

into the public mind falsehood, invective, and bitter contempt. The respectability of this world ranged itself against the rights of man. Then, as now, offensive nicknames were hurled in clouds against the apostles and disciples of real representation, and every man who sought for the people a system of self-government, lost *status* in the estimation of his friends, was branded as a 'Jacobin' and denounced as an infidel. In this work, the church, as usual, took a leading and active part. Every pulpit of the establishment rang with the most virulent abuse of 'levelers' and 'atheists;' Scripture was perverted, with profane zeal, to play upon the ignorance of the multitude, and to rouse the most infernal passions, until, goaded to frenzy, lawless mobs, drunk with beer and with clerical precepts, rose against the most active friends of human progress, and, with the connivance of the magistrates, destroyed the property of reformers, and drove the most conspicuous of them to other and more hospitable lands. This was the first act of the great drama not yet played out. The active friends of real representation were dispersed, its converts silenced, and the principle which had put forth such vigorous branches, was cut down to its roots.

Those roots, however, were vital. Fury could not reach them. Law could not extract them from the soil of human hearts. Violence could not kill them. They remained—the principle remained, unchanged and unchangeable. The truth which quickened it no tyranny could destroy; the congruity of that truth with reason, equity, and the spirit of Christianity, no state prosecutions nor clerical vituperations could crush out of it. All that commended it to the mind of the country previously to this outbreak of aristocratic anger, survived the storm. Not an argument perished in the crusade. Not a living germ was spilt. Years rolled on, adding to the world's age, to the country's experience, and to the taxation of the people. War made its entrance upon the stage of events, and for a time engrossed the attention which had been, heretofore, directed to 'national representation.' It was an interval of madness. Excited passion hurried forward the nation in the career of ruin. The voice of prudence was drowned in the din of conflict, and, under cover of the 'pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war,' government bound upon the shoulders of the people an unprecedented, and, as it seems likely to prove, an intolerable burden of debt. The game of the aristocracy was played out. The fit of insanity was over. Peace came, and with it exhaustion, distress, discontent, reflection. The doctrine of government, by *bona fide* national representation, again presented itself to the public mind, and again its progress was like the lightning shining from the east unto the west. A second revolution in France, marked by unwonted

moderation in its leaders, occurring simultaneously with a general election in this empire, gave an impulse to the cause which aristocracy strove in vain to stem. The Duke of Wellington, by his memorable *dictum*, sought to bar out the incoming tide of popular feeling, but the swelling flood speedily swept it away. The Tory ministry were beaten in their own house—they made way for the Whigs, and after a brief but severe struggle, the Reform Bill became law.

The second act of the drama closed in seeming triumph. In the first, the people had been put down—in the second, they were deceived. It is painful, at this day, to look back upon the delirium of joy which followed the success of this effort for real representation. That long, loud, universal shout of gladness which shook the earth and rose up to heaven, gave testimony to the hold which the idea had taken of the nation's heart. Wisely was it concealed from them, at that moment of excitement, that they had 'scotched the snake only, not killed it.' The truth displayed itself by slow degrees. The rush which the people had made against the outer barriers reared by aristocracy to keep out government by opinion, carried them on beyond the line of parliamentary reform, and served to put within their reach a few of the more important objects upon which they had set their hearts. The middle classes fancied they had reaped satisfactory results from the change. A new election, under the auspices of a Tory administration, now recalled to power by William the Fourth, brought to light some of the prominent defects of the new system of representation, and proved the existing machinery to be inadequate to give full expression to the popular will. Meanwhile, owing to causes which we cannot stay to specify, the commerce of the country received a sudden expansion. Trade flourished. Manufacturing capital and enterprise won golden spoils. The middle classes, devoted to the successful pursuits of wealth, viewed the gradual re-encroachments of the aristocracy without serious concern. It was not in the midst of social prosperity that the failure of the Reform Bill was to be detected. The victory they had achieved, it was even then apparent, was not so complete as they had, at first, hoped for; but on the whole, they were not disposed to complain. Presently, the commercial horizon became darkened, and the bare prospect of want of employment, rendered more gloomy by the enactment of the New Poor Law, forced upon the vast masses of the working men of the country the fact that, whatever others might be, *they* were unrepresented.

Again, the hero of the piece, the doctrine of government by national representation, came forward upon the stage, and, this time, it took the form of 'The People's Charter.' The principles

contained in this document, as we have already intimated, were not novel, but they were now chiefly interesting to the labouring classes. They whom the Reform Bill had admitted to the franchise, did not yet perceive that the question involved touched them as really, although not so directly, as it did the unrepresented. Believing, as they did, that the supreme power of the state was lodged in their hands, and that the aristocracy were virtually at their mercy, they saw no pressing necessity for enlarging the basis of the constitution. The old doctrine, consequently, came to be viewed in a new and very disadvantageous light. It was regarded as only the poor man's question, and, as such, it was left exclusively to the poor. The consequences of this mistake were disastrous. Alienation of feeling quickly succeeded an apprehended diversity of interests. The classes drew off each from the other. The poor, left to fight their own battle, nourished a fatal resentment against all above them. Keen-eyed demagogues took advantage of their position, fanned their anger, and organized their numbers. What the electors would not help them to do, they resolved to effect by their own unaided strength. There were not wanting men to remind them that the physical force of the country dwelt with them. The Reform Bill had been carried by a demonstration of that force—why should not the Charter be wrested from the ruling powers by an employment of it? Foolish preparations were accordingly made. A rising was attempted. A few riots scared the middle-classes into an utter renunciation of the very principle which themselves had insisted upon in the Reform Bill, and threw them into willing alliance with might against right. The military put down insurrection with the utmost ease, and the folly and misconduct of the Chartists dismissed the subject of national representation from the public mind, covered with their own disgrace. Such was the pitiable termination of act the third.

Simultaneously with this infatuated movement of the working men, the middle class laid siege to the strong-holds of monopoly. Commercial distress disturbed their tranquillity, and, as a body, entertaining an all but invincible repugnance to a complete organic reform, they determined upon wielding the existing machinery of representation, to work out a total repeal of the Corn Laws. The second parliament chosen under the Reform Bill laughed at them, positively hooted them, refused to give the question a hearing, and the prime minister—a Whig too, of the reform administration—taunted them with the madness of their project. This was the first baneful fruit of the division of the two great classes. Nevertheless, rude insult, received at the hands of their own representatives, did not prevent the middle-class from agitating the question which they had made up their minds

to settle. The increasing depression of trading and manufacturing industry lent weight to their arguments and pungency to their appeals. To the unwearied efforts of the anti-corn-law league came the financial embarrassments of the state, as though to ensure the success of the enterprise. Ministers had attempted to replenish an empty exchequer by adding to the burden of taxation, but their attempt had signally failed. Meanwhile, the expenditure of the country increased as its resources decayed. A change of system became a matter of necessity, and the Whig cabinet attacked first the sugar and timber monopolies; and, in their last extremity, dashed at the landed interest, by proposing a fixed duty of eight shillings per quarter on foreign corn. The monopolists united their forces, defeated the Whigs, and compelled them to appeal to the country. The worth of the Reform Bill was put to the test, and found wanting. A majority of conservatives, pledged against corn-law repeal, was returned. Parliament met. The Whig ministers were unceremoniously ousted by a direct resolution of want of confidence in them. Sir Robert Peel formed a new administration, dismissed the house, and said he would take time to consider.

It was now but too apparent that the supreme power of the empire was safely lodged in the hands of the aristocracy. The working men had tried in vain to upset it by means of physical violence; the middle class had been thrown, in their first struggle with it, on the narrow electoral ground ceded to them by the Reform Bill. The necessity for a cordial reconciliation between the two divided sections of the community could no longer be concealed. The thoughts of every honest patriot turned wistfully to that quarter. The *Nonconformist*, a weekly newspaper, then recently established, took the lead in the hopeful and much hoped-for enterprise. Reverting to the old subject of *bonâ fide* national representation, it laboured, through a series of articles, subsequently collected together in a cheap pamphlet, and widely circulated through all parts of the land, to demonstrate the right of the working men to the franchise, and, by calm reasoning, to meet the objections commonly urged in bar of their claim. Here, once more, the old doctrine was thrown upon the surface, with this variation only, that it appeared under a new name. The *Nonconformist* entitled it 'Complete Suffrage,' which cognomen, up to the present moment, it has retained.

This series of articles had not, we believe, been brought to a close, before a new actor appeared upon the stage. Attention had scarcely been afresh awakened, when a fitting man stood forth to turn it to account. This was none other than Joseph Sturge, a member of the Society of Friends, known to the British public by his philanthropic exertions for the liberation of the slaves in

our West Indian possessions. Mr. Sturge had just returned to England from a visit to the United States, whither he had proceeded, at his own expense, on an anti-slavery mission, and a tour of observation. Running a just line of discrimination between the social evils and the political institutions of that country, he drew his conclusions in favour of the latter, whilst he deplored with heartfelt sorrow the former. Almost immediately upon regaining his native land, he unhesitatingly stepped forth to convert that into a practical movement, which previously, had been little more than a happy idea.

At first sight, Joseph Sturge would not have appeared the man best qualified to conduct this fresh enterprise against arbitrary, and virtually irresponsible power. Gifted with intellectual ability, strong, it is true, but not commanding—neither possessing nor pretending to the powers of eloquence—it did not seem probable that his was the master-spirit which the exigencies of the country required. Nor in one sense was it. Had the work to which he stood pledged demanded a lofty genius, a mind capable of seeing at a glance the actual state of things, of reading by intuition a nation's real wants, and of swaying by its own pre-eminent strength the varied passions of conflicting classes, Joseph Sturge would have been unfitted for the arduous undertaking. Such a man, ordinary habits of thought had led the people to expect, to sigh for, as indispensable. Something akin to disappointment, therefore, was felt when Joseph Sturge appeared upon the scene. His appearance, however, has served to correct a very prevalent mistake. There is a power stronger than that of the intellect—qualifications of leadership, of more sterling worth than oratorical gifts. The cause of the suffrage wanted, above and beyond all things else, high character; and its only remaining chance of success was, that it should go forth to the world recommended by the stamp of moral dignity. Men had seen too many perversions of splendid abilities to confide in them again, and the temper of all parties was such as to render them accessible on this subject to no power but that of an honest and virtuous heart. Joseph Sturge brought in aid of this movement moral qualifications of no common order. Adopting the principles of peace, peculiar to the sect of which he was a member, attaching to them the highest importance, and exemplifying them in his own personal conduct and habits, he gave to society the most satisfactory guarantee, that under no circumstances would he consent to lead the people into violent collision with existing authorities. His translucent honesty imparted a still higher value to his mild and forbearing spirit. All who had marked his career might see that it was not a wild production of nature, standing where it originally shot up, but that it was

grafted upon a sense of responsibility and a fear of God. A heart naturally generous, converted by Christian love into the seat of ardent philanthropy—energies which no labours can weary—a simple devotedness to duty which shrinks from no sacrifice, stands appalled before no danger—faith in justice the most child-like and confiding, combined with unaffected distrust of himself—and when convinced of the rectitude of any given course, an indomitable will—such were the qualifications which fitted Joseph Sturge for the post into which Providence appeared to introduce him. The power of the man was speedily felt—the power of meekness and of moral worth. The suffrage question in his hands assumed a new and startling aspect. Its principles were what they ever had been, but its character was transformed. It was not now a rude, noisy, clamorous, and menacing thing, but a thing whose eye was gentle, whose voice was clear and soft, whose language was persuasive, and upon whose countenance played the light of pure benevolence. Truths which had hitherto been associated with violence, he set upon the basis of peace, threw around them the air of temperance, and, as far as the influence of a leader can extend, infused into them the mild but resolute, the forbearing but equally indomitable spirit of religion.

To hearts flaming with earnestness of purpose, opportunities for action are speedily revealed. The fire within them, like a blazing torch, flings abroad its own rays, and discloses to view, tinged with its own light, modes and means of putting intention into effect, which, to listless observers, would have been shrouded in darkness. A meeting of anti-corn-law deputies assembled at Manchester, on Wednesday, November 17, 1841. Mr. Sturge, who had taken a deep interest in the movement for the repeal of the tax on the subsistence of the people, attended that meeting. At the conclusion of the business for which the deputies had been specially convened, the chair having been vacated, and a new chairman appointed, Mr. Sturge, in a very unpretending manner, brought forward the subject of ‘complete suffrage.’ A free conversation ensued, and a general desire was expressed by the body of deputies then present, to promote a movement for thorough organic reform. A resolution requesting Joseph Sturge and W. Sharman Crawford, M.P. for Rochdale, to draw up a declaration, which, after signature by the deputies, might be published, was passed unanimously. A brief interval of silence and seeming inaction succeeded. About the middle of December, however, we find Mr. Sturge again at Manchester, and immediately afterwards the following declaration was put forth:—

‘Deeply impressed with the conviction of the evils arising from class legislation, and of the sufferings thereby inflicted upon our in-

dustrious fellow-subjects, the undersigned affirm that a large majority of the people of this country are unjustly excluded from that fair, full, and free exercise of the elective franchise to which they are entitled by the great principle of Christian equity, and also by the British constitution, for 'no subject of England can be constrained to pay any aids or taxes, even for the defence of the realme, or the support of the government, but such as are imposed by his own consent, or that of his representatives in parliament.'*

To this declaration Mr. Sturge first appended his own name; and considering the framing of it to have originated in the request of the friends of the total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, he placed it first in their hands, to give them an opportunity of procuring signatures. It was then sent forth as a means of gauging the reform feeling of the existing constituencies. The active exertions of Mr. Sturge for the abolition of slavery, and for the promotion of peace and temperance, opened to him special facilities for carrying out his designs. He put himself in communication with the known and prominent friends of these causes. Within these circles, his was a charmed name, carrying with it a moral influence of no common potency. The great principle of real representation embodied in the above declaration, thus flowed to the public mind through untainted channels, and came under general notice, sparkling in its own purity, unclouded by the turbid elements of faction or of party.

A convention of anti-corn-law delegates at Edinburgh, a banquet at Glasgow, and the great anti-corn-law conference in London, severally held at the commencement of 1842, offered fresh opportunities to the now installed representative of the suffrage question, to proclaim and enforce his views, of which he was not backward to avail himself. In each instance, the occasion was specially fitting, the line of proceeding was wisely chosen, and the success was exhilarating. The doctrine of full, fair, and free representation, was thus brought under the notice of picked men of the middle class, both English and Scotch, at a moment when the grievous wrong under which they groaned, and to throw off which, they had assembled together, laid bare to the quick their sense of the evils of class legislation. In no case did Mr. Sturge impede the specific business which these delegates had gathered together to transact, or with unseemly zeal thrust his opinions upon men when occupied with their own affairs. Time and place were fixed upon, distinct and apart from the session of deputies, who were invited by private circular to free converse with Mr. Sturge, on that subject which now filled his heart. The mildness of his manners, the sim-

* See Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. i., book i., chap. i.

plicity of his speech, his evident sincerity of purpose and benevolence of soul, added weight to the justice and reasonableness of the truths he propounded. The course of events, however, operated still more powerfully to further his views. Sir Robert Peel's new sliding scale was submitted to the legislature, and the advocates of free trade felt and resented the premier's policy as equally insulting and cruel. The hopelessness of efficient relief from a parliament of landed proprietors stared them in the face, and momentary despair drove numbers to take refuge in the movement for complete suffrage. The progress of that question was, accordingly, rapid beyond all former precedent; but it was ostensible, rather than real—the sudden wash of a flood, not the steady rising of a tide—the outburst of passion, far more than the growth of principle.

Such as it was, however, it invited instant action. Transient or abiding as might be this not unexpected swell of feeling, prudence dictated the obvious policy of turning it to account—of digging channels into which a portion of it might run—of creating an organization which might serve to collect what was real, and to fix, if possible, what was originally volatile. A 'Birmingham Complete Suffrage Union' had been formed, and a provisional committee appointed. They cast into a suitable shape, for a memorial to the Queen, the declaration first issued, distributed it with appropriate directions throughout the country, and made the first approach to a reconciliation between the two divided classes, by inviting the signatures of both electors and non-electors. They gained two objects by this step. They were enabled by means of it to feel, without awakening suspicion, the pulse of the public temper; to ascertain whether hope might be reasonably entertained of healing the existing feud between the middle class and the working men; and they created a well-defined constituency for electing delegates representing both sections, who, in conference, might agree upon a common basis of reconciliation, upon which might be subsequently erected an efficient machinery of agitation. Their plan so far answered their wishes as to convince them of the expediency of summoning a conference forthwith. It is not our purpose to discuss the policy, but simply to sketch the outline, of their proceedings. That wisdom which comes after the event is, invariably, as worthless as it is cheap. Men can only form their judgment upon the materials which come within their reach, but all existing materials, the unknown as well as the known, will go to make up the actual issue. Hence, the fallibility of those who go before facts, and the infallibility of those who come after them. 'I think it *will* be so and so,' is much more likely to be wrong than 'I thought it *would* be so and so.' Direct overtures to reconciliation were

possibly not the most feasible method of securing it; and the first symptoms of returning good feeling may not always indicate the fulness of time, when previously hostile parties should be set face to face, and urged to settle terms of agreement and shake hands. The subsidence of ill-will is always somewhat slow, and the wounds of pride, even where the healing process has fairly commenced, do not at once lose their irritability. These wise reflections, we confess, have been mainly suggested to our minds by the results of the conference alluded to, rather than by a glance at the ascertained *a priori* probabilities. If we had fears that the proposed gathering was premature, they were not, it may be conceded, deeply rooted in our judgment; nor have we, perhaps, as yet, a right to affirm that those fears have been subsequently realized. But we will not detain our readers in suspense. We proceed, therefore, with the history.

The conference assembled at Birmingham on the 5th of April, 1842. Eighty-seven delegates from different parts of England and Scotland, and four visitors from Ireland, met the provisional committee, who were allowed to take part in the proceedings, but not to vote. The chamber in which they met was the committee room of the New Town Hall, a somewhat dark and gloomy room, not altogether out of keeping with the grave solemnity of the occasion. A long table ran down its centre, and the benches occupied by the delegates were ranged on either hand, and at both ends of it, in form similar to that of the House of Commons. The men deputed to represent the respective classes mingled freely together, nor, except in individual instances, could either party be distinguished by the external aspect of its representatives. The proceedings were not unworthy of the business in hand. The sessions of the body lasted four days, the discussions occupying about nine hours each day. The forms observed were regular, and adhered to with the utmost strictness. Brilliant speeches there were none, but the debates were always animated, and for the most part well sustained. Sentiments were aptly expressed and forcibly delivered. A deep tone of earnestness ran through them all. The errors of the past were freely adverted to on both sides, and occasionally self-vindication compelled the speakers to tread upon tender ground; yet not once during the whole time did interruption occur, or disapprobation find vent in rude clamour. Excitement was intense, but it glowed rather than flamed. Profound attention was, with few exceptions, given to each speaker, without distinction of party. There were no outbreaks of passion—no effusions of bile, or violence of recrimination. The spirit of conciliation took off the sharp edges of firm resolve. Care for the public weal appeared to hold in hand, and to control with little

effort the impetuosity of strong attachments. As the several stages of interval between the two sections were safely passed, interest became more feverish; and when the last topic of difference, the discussion upon which lasted the whole of the third day, was under debate, excitement verged upon the bounds of irritability. At this moment a trivial incident occurred which seemed likely to destroy the whole work of the previous sessions. The representatives of the working men, with the leave of the conference, retired to another room to remodify a critical resolution. Indications had previously appeared that feeling was growing serious. The time allotted for absence was ten minutes. The conference waited three quarters of an hour. Murmurs of dissatisfaction passed to and fro amongst the middle-class delegates, who began to fancy their patience was trifled with. A message was despatched to the parties who had retired, that unless they could speedily agree upon their resolution, the conference would feel itself compelled to proceed with other business. The messenger returned, and with a supercilious air, gave answer that 'the conference might proceed to other business as soon as they pleased.' The spark dropped upon inflammable materials, but the fire of resentment was quickly extinguished. It was hinted by one of the delegates present, that the offensiveness of the message might possibly be in the manners of the messenger, and that a quarter of an hour's further forbearance might be rewarded by substantial agreement. Within five minutes of this incident the party returned. Every eye turned anxiously towards them;—all held their breath in expectation. The silence was oppressive. Mr. Lovett then stood forward and read the resolution upon which the representatives of the working men were agreed. Its tone was conciliatory, and its tenour reasonable. A modification or two was suggested, which Mr. Lovett consented to adopt. The last ground of dispute was now cut away. Joy gleamed in every eye, and in some, glittered behind tears. The resolution was put to the meeting. Every hand was held up in its favour—and now emotion would have vent. A shout of triumph shook the walls of the committee room. Delegates of both classes grasped each other by the hand, and mutually congratulated each other upon their happy escape from the menaced danger.

The last day's work of the conference involved few points for discussion. It consisted chiefly in adopting plans of practical organization, framed with a view to give effect to the principles already recognised. It will be unnecessary for us to bring under the notice of our readers the several resolutions, addresses, or rules agreed upon. The first practical resolution is the only one we shall cite. It runs thus:—

‘ That an association be now formed to be entitled, ‘ *The National Complete Suffrage Union*,’ and that the following be its object:—
 1. The creating and extending an enlightened public opinion in favour of the principle and necessary details of complete suffrage,—viz., the extension of the elective franchise to every man twenty-one years of age, who has not been deprived of his citizenship in consequence of a verdict of his countrymen; the abolition of the property qualification for members of parliament; the adoption of voting by ballot; the dividing the country into equal electoral districts; the payment of all the legal election expenses, and a reasonable remuneration to members of parliament; and that annual parliaments are a proper means for securing responsibility of members to their constituents.’

The spirit in which the agitation of these political truths is to be carried on, appears in the following extract from the first address of ‘ *The National Complete Suffrage Union* to their countrymen’ :—

‘ Having assumed as our basis the principle of universal adult male suffrage, labour for its diffusion among all classes; keep simply by the principle. Believing that union is strength, abstain from every source of mutual recrimination; bury past animosities; consign to oblivion hitherto discrepancies of sentiment; abolish, as far as may be, every term and watchword that may have been the badge of party or section; and, henceforth, in language simple as your aim, strive in harmony for the welfare of our common country. Draw your ammunition from the magazine of argument; take every suitable opportunity to discuss in a free and kindly spirit the things in which you may have differed from others, or among yourselves; studiously retain your temper as you would preserve yourself and persuade your opponent.’

The adoption by the conference of the six points, whilst it tended to prove the honesty of the middle class delegates, was not calculated to advance the cause with that section of the community which they ostensibly represented. Political knowledge had not yet made such rapid strides as to help recent and timid converts to the conclusion, that these points were but integral portions of one great principle. Numbers, therefore, who had given in a hesitating adherence to the truth of complete suffrage, seen only in its simplicity, and who believed themselves to have been already driven by stress of misgovernment to the recognition of a bolder and more democratic doctrine than they would have spontaneously embraced, took alarm at the decision of the conference, and retreated upon conclusions which, as they were more familiarly known, were regarded as more safe and satisfactory. It is somewhat singular, that the only two points violently objected to were also the only two points sanctioned by the ancient practice of the constitution—annual parliaments and the payment of members. There existed a strong proba-

bility, that had the majority of the working men consented to restrict immediate agitation, to the suffrage and the ballot, success would have been much more rapid, and the remaining details would have followed as a matter of course. Such a concession, however, under the circumstances of the case, was hardly to be expected. They had the best of the argument, and they considered it but fair to press it. They could show reason in favour of all their claims, even if they could not display prudence in putting forward the whole of them in one batch. The result was not only foreseen, but distinctly foretold. The light let in upon the just-awaking minds of electors was too strong to be borne; and men who had begun to look about them without discomfort, pained by the sudden blaze, deliberately closed their eyes and turned to other subjects. As, however, in the earlier part of the year, the expansion, so now, the collapse of public favour was more apparent than real. It was plain that the progress of the question would now be slow in comparison of what it had been; but it was equally plain that every step would be sure.

At the request of the Birmingham conference, Mr. Sharman Crawford, member for Rochdale, undertook the task of testing the strength of the complete suffrage cause in the House of Commons. Accordingly, on Tuesday, April 21, he submitted to the House the following resolution:—

‘Whereas various petitions have been presented to this House, stating to the effect that under the present system of election laws the people are not duly represented; and that they are thus deprived of the acknowledged right of freemen to have a voice in the making of the laws by which they are governed, and in imposing the taxes which they are required to pay; and, therefore, praying that the right of voting may be extended to the adult male population of the realm, subject to no limitations or restrictions but such as may be necessary for the safe and correct practical exercise of the right itself; that votes should be taken by the ballot; that election districts should be equalized, to accord with the number of electors; that no qualification should be demanded from members, but that of being duly elected by a majority of votes; that representatives should be paid for their services at the public expense; and that elections should be annual; and whereas, complaint having been made, as above stated, that under the present limitation of the franchise and laws of election, there is not a full and free representation of the people, it is, therefore, the duty of this House to take into immediate consideration the amendment of these laws, with a view of giving to every portion of the community a full, fair, and free representation in the Commons House of parliament; and this House will, on an early day, resolve itself into a committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the same.’

The division in favour of this resolution was somewhat more favourable than might have been anticipated. There were, for the motion, sixty-seven votes, two tellers, four who paired off in favour of it, and one who had left the House in consequence of illness; making a total of seventy-four. The debate, however, greatly diminished the value of the division. It sufficiently indicated that most of those members who were willing to vote for an early consideration of the subject, were anything but friends to the doctrines of complete suffrage. The resolution, consequently, may be said to have failed of the only end which its promoters could have contemplated, for it did not furnish any certain clue to the real opinions of the people's representatives.

Meanwhile, beyond the walls of parliament, the cause made silent and not inconsiderable progress. Able lecturers were abroad, both in England and in Scotland. The exposure, by Mr. Roebuck's 'Elections' Compromise Committee, of the infamously corrupt practices resorted to by parliamentary members and constituencies, and the indignation roused by the imposition of an Income Tax, opened the eyes of many to the necessity of a thorough change. One by one, a goodly number of the liberal provincial journals took up the question, and able articles followed each other, week after week, in quick succession, to batter down remaining objections to the movement. The Nottingham, Ipswich, and Southampton elections occurred almost simultaneously to develop its electoral strength, and to cheer on its friends. Associations were springing up in every large town, and in many of the smaller ones, north and south of the Tweed. All appearances served to quicken expectation of another, but sounder expansion of the public mind, when, driven to desperation by their sufferings, and left in neglect by the government and legislature of the country, the operatives broke out into wide-spread insurrection, and our mining and manufacturing districts became the scene of a strike unprecedented in its extent, singularly mild in its pervading characteristics, originally directed almost exclusively to an increase of wages, but artfully fomented and turned to political account by the old Chartist leaders. The authorities took the alarm. The middle classes were turned out as special constables. The police forces were strengthened. The military were despatched to the scenes of disorder—collision ensued in several towns—loss of life—exasperation of feeling—the old sore, not yet healed, broke out afresh—and the prospects of the complete suffrage movement were again overshadowed by a dark cloud.

The moment was a critical one. There was, on the one hand, a strong temptation to shrink from a manly and explicit avowal,

in the very whirlwind of popular commotion, of democratic principles; on the other, a danger of lending a seeming sanction to proceedings which set at defiance the authority of law. Government, too, was engaged in grappling with its now formidable foe, and zeal for crushing the insurrection overlooked niceties in dealing with the rights of the subject. In this emergency, Mr. Sturge and his coadjutors remained firmly at their post. They issued two addresses; the first, to the middle and enfranchised classes—the other, to the working and unenfranchised classes of their countrymen; the former, urging a prompt and peaceful demonstration of sympathy for the oppressed, and setting forth the triumph of the essential principles of *bonâ fide* national representation as the only sufficient safeguard of interests not yet ruined, and of constitutional liberties not yet destroyed; the latter assuring the misguided sons of toil of hearty condolence with them in their sufferings, and exhorting them to resign all hopeless contests, and to resort to peaceful efforts and moral means alone. The council at the same time adopted a memorial to the queen, and convened a conference for the 7th of September. The document bore upon the face of it sad marks of haste—the measure, of inconsideration—neither of which could find an excuse in aught less than the extempore character and immediate urgency of the crisis. The conference was necessarily postponed, and an extraordinary council convoked in its room. The result of its meeting was, the appointment of a national conference to be held at Birmingham during the last week of December, to seal, if possible, a union between the two classes, by agreeing upon the details of a bill embodying the principles of both, to be submitted to parliament in the ensuing sessions. Before these pages reach the hands of our readers, the fruits of this determination will be developed. We shall not, therefore, indulge in anticipations. At the time at which we write, appearances are not such as to warrant any sanguine expectations of a highly favourable issue. The cause is not yet strong enough in the affections of the middle class of this country to secure it against the designs of faction; and faction may haply ensure the passage of complete suffrage principles through another phasis, before they reach the heart of the great social body. Be this as it may, they will be not a whit the more or the less true. They may suffer a temporary eclipse, but they cannot be destroyed.

We have thus attempted to give our readers a sketch of the rise and progress of the complete suffrage movement: necessarily imperfect, it will, nevertheless, we trust, be found substantially accurate. We are unwilling to trespass further upon

the attention of our friends, but we cannot forbear a closing observation or two, suggested to our own minds by a review of the history, now for the first time submitted to the public.

No thoughtful student of passing events can have failed to mark the inextinguishable vitality of the deep central principle—government by real national representation; of which, corresponding societies, reform bills, charters, complete suffrage associations, are nothing more than successive shoots, modified only by the character of the times. How does it happen that, invariably, when the ordinary resources of conventional arrangements fail of securing the welfare of our country—in days of darkness and distress, when society is forced by stress of misfortune to quit its hold of fashionable fallacies, and to revert to the fundamental principles of equity,—how does it happen, we repeat, that the minds of men instinctively turn to this doctrine, and view it as the natural refuge from the evils of misgovernment? What hope is there of crushing it by opposition? What prospect of its dying of neglect? What likelihood of stifling it with contempt? Put down in one form, it quickly reappears in another. Every effort to root it out of the public heart has proved unsuccessful. It has laughed to scorn the violence put in motion against it by the aristocracy, as ghosts are said to smile at material weapons in the hands of man. It has survived the follies and crimes of its own professed friends; and ever, as it pushes itself afresh above the surface, it shows itself purged of some of the grosser elements with which it was erst associated. It is now allying itself with peace, sobriety, and Christian equity. It is putting forth its whole influence to assuage the unhallowed passions of party strife and sectional prejudice. It is addressing itself in the accents of meek remonstrance and calm appeal to the truest, the noblest, the most abiding feelings of the human heart. With self-respect unshaken, and in self-reliance not to be overmastered, it stands forth in the face of scorn, derision, hate, and perhaps danger, to solicit nothing more than reverent attention. It goes unabashed into the clear light of Christian truth and Christian morality, and asks the severest scrutiny of its pretensions when subjected to the full blaze of the religion of the gospel. If, consequently, it is to be banished these realms, it must be by far other methods than any hitherto employed. Certain it is, however, that the dearest interests of the country require either its speedy extinction, or its prompt recognition. The national mind can never reach a healthy state whilst this doctrine of complete representation continues to ferment it. These heavings to and fro—these restless tossings—these convulsive struggles, the inevitable consequence of a widespread sense of injustice, make sad inroads upon social peace,

and absorb in unceasing political agitation energies which else might run in far more useful channels. Nor can it be lost sight of, that as the movement extends, those who are resolved at all hazards to defeat it, must call in the aid of very questionable allies. Physical violence, even when it is distinguished by the government stamp, is not precisely the fittest guardian to whose protection religious men should be found resorting; and yet, nothing but efficient representation will render a resort to it superfluous. The final triumph of complete suffrage principles can only be deferred by sacrifices, civil, moral, and religious, which virtuous and patriotic men may well hesitate to make.

And wherefore should they make it? What are those inherent charms—what those happy fruits of aristocracy, that the truly religious of the community should eagerly gather around it to prevent its downfall? Which of its leading principles, or its usual practices, legitimately commends it to the affections of the followers of Christ? It has a glory, but it is the glory of earth, not of heaven; a refinement, but it is that of luxury, not of virtue; a code of honour, but it is based upon the subversion, not upon the recognition of the morality of revelation; an influence, but it is in favour of corruption, not of purity; pursuits, but they tend not to exalt society; a religion, but it is a religion of outward form, not of inward power. That it has done aught to advance the spiritual kingdom of our Lord—that it habitually harmonizes with the essential characteristics of that kingdom, with its primary laws and obvious designs—that it has proved itself a valuable auxiliary to truth—that, in the nature of things, its countenance may be calculated upon for the encouragement of peace, temperance, chastity, meekness, piety—no one out of its own exclusive pale will have the hardihood to assert. Why then should it be expected of those who have taken upon them the yoke of evangelic religion, that they should employ themselves in propping up on every hand principles of government and legislative privileges which have nothing in common with the world's highest welfare, and which are evidently marked out by their own intrinsic worthlessness, and by providential intimations, for ultimate dissolution and decay? If the spirituality of God's church be an object deserving of pursuit, of pecuniary risk, of worldly sacrifice, surely it will not be unbeseeming to men who are labouring, sighing, praying for its attainment, to ask themselves what one insurmountable obstacle it is which lies in their way to reach it. Is it class, or general representation—the exclusive or the democratic principle? Were the people fairly masters of their own affairs, how long would an established church continue to misrepresent Christianity, to foster popular ignorance, to cripple educational effort, to abet

every oppressive monopoly, to bless and consecrate the emblems and the spirit of war, and to hunt down, worry, and strip of its earthly comforts, vital godliness wherever it displays itself? Truly, protestant dissenters have little reason to cling with the tenacity of fond attachment to aristocratic supremacy. It will do but little in return to promote their interests, or to advance the cause of the Master whom they serve.

Politics have governed religion long enough; it is time that religion should govern politics. Those immortal—immortal because divine—principles of equity by which Christians regulate themselves, their homes, their churches, why should they not also give form and character to civil institutions? Carried out in this direction, do they become false? To give to others what we ask for ourselves—to recognise in all men the claims of their common relationship—to vindicate the poor, and to beware of ‘calling the proud happy’—to sacrifice merely artificial distinctions, which, whilst they puff up human vanity, aggravate likewise human woe,—what prevents our aiming at these noble ends in the department of national politics? So far as we know, the complete suffrage movement is the first attempt in this land to mould government upon the principles of Christianity—the first avowed effort to modify political institutions by the light and life of evangelical morality. In obedience to the equity of the gospel, and in deference to its claims upon conscience, Mr. Sturge has himself taken up, and calls upon other men to take up, the cause of the politically degraded, the slaves of British exclusiveness and British *caste*. Prejudice against colour we are free from, for we have lived out of the reach of temptation; but prejudice against poverty twines itself with all the feelings of our hearts. Men in circumstances of respectability, even the best of them, see no great cruelty, no wrong, no humiliation, inflicted upon the poor by thrusting them out of the door of citizenship, and branding them as unworthy of civil trust, even to the extent of one poor vote. But let misfortune overtake them and hurry them down to the deep places of society, and when to all the inevitable disadvantages of destitution is super-added that of civil outlawry, probably their views will undergo a change. The lowliness to which Providence reduces us may be borne with cheerful spirit; it touches the circumstances of the man, but not the man himself. But it is hard to be doomed to neglect and forgetfulness by the laws of our fellows; for even when such things alter not our external condition, the iron enters into the soul. The poor may not ordinarily evince much feeling in the matter, nor display any acute sense of degradation. So much the worse; for it proves that oppression has rubbed away one of the finer elements of human nature, and has thus

prepared it for a course incompatible with due self-respect. We look to this movement with some interest, as being eminently adapted to call out into exercise some of the highest principles of Christian morals, as well as to produce some of the happiest fruits of Christian benevolence. Were the church of Christ in this country, as one man, to bless it—were good men of all sects to smile instead of frown upon its now infant efforts—were pious citizenship to lend it a willing and a guiding hand, instead of shrinking from it, lest perchance it might expose to the old taunt ‘a friend of publicans and sinners,’ it would hardly, we think, bring their religion into disrepute, or narrow the range of their influence,—it would not injure the church, it would do no harm to the world. Themselves would not be deteriorated; the poor would be greatly served.

One word more, and we have done. The scope of our remarks will be entirely misapprehended, should our readers impute to us an opinion that society is to be regenerated by political institutions. Were complete suffrage adopted to-morrow, men’s hearts, habits, pursuits, beliefs, would still be what they are. It belongs not to forms of civil government to purge the human mind of its natural grossness, to destroy its selfishness, or to open to it the fountains of true happiness. Organic change, even the most searching and complete, will assuredly fail to touch the evil that is *in* man. It will make him neither virtuous nor blest. True Christianity alone is competent to grapple with and to subdue, to exalt and to refine our common nature. But complete suffrage may, and we verily believe, will, remove from between Christianity and the people of this empire, many conventional and artificial barriers. It will tend to break down the spirit of *caste*, than which nothing is more inimical to the triumphs of revealed truth. It will allay the excitement and exasperation of party politics. It will put an end to monopolies, which, like a chain of forts, have in this country, from time immemorial, obstructed the free march of the religion of Jesus. It will sweep out of the way a system of ecclesiastical sanctity and priestly mediation, the worldly emoluments and the legal power of whose official agents and abettors have always stood opposed to the spread of genuine piety. It will thus open to the gospel a wide door of utterance—will give it room for free and effectual play—will throw the church of Christ upon its own resources, and compel it to fling off that immense mass of hypocrisy which now cleaves to it, which conceals its real character, paralyses its tenderest sympathies, and well nigh deprives it of influence for good. Therefore it is that we take a deep religious interest in the progress of a movement, in itself, purely political. We have unbounded confidence in the energies, the

skill, the power of Christianity, and we are anxious to see her have fair play, which aristocratic supremacy will never allow her. And if by acting upon the principles of revealed truth in regard to civil affairs—if, by subjecting our political creed to its penetrating and kindly influences, it should be so ordered that to *its* power over the heart, and to *its* benevolent tendencies, our working men will ultimately have to ascribe their enfranchisement, and will be compelled to acknowledge ‘religion has done this;’ we do think that such a consummation would deal a heavier blow at socialism and low, ignorant infidelity, than the most austere political Pharisaism in the world. Not by coercion and exclusion shall we be able to stay the enmity of the masses to the cross of Christ. Alas! we have lost our hold upon them, and they are like sheep without a shepherd. But no denunciation of their vices, no expressions of abhorrence, no holding up of our hands in astonishment, no curling of the lip in contempt, no exclamations of ‘Stand by thyself,’ whether in a temporal or spiritual sense, will avail to win them back. Misguided as they are, they are yet men. Human emotions swell in their bosoms; human susceptibilities have an abiding place in their hearts. If we would lead them, we must win them; if we would win them, we must give them their rights. If we would imbue them with higher principles than any by which they are at present actuated, we must let those principles pour their tide of influence through the only channel by which the ten thousand sons of toil are now accessible. Oh, the vast, the illimitable field open at this moment to British Christians! the career of true glory upon which religion, in this our land, is invited to enter. Those immense tracts of yet unsanctified humanity! shall none reap them? Is there no way to these men’s confidence? No inlet whatever to their souls? No means of gathering them about us, that we may point out to them the way to true happiness? Who shall say this? What do they ask? Aught that religion may not grant? No, no! They implore us to ‘do unto others as we would they should do unto us.’ Complete suffrage is just the development of this sublime rule of conduct in the political world. We long to see those who bind this sentence about their brows, and write it on the hem of their garments, display their faith in it, not merely in the petty, higgling matters of private life, but in the wider sphere, and upon the more elevated stage, of national affairs. We yet hope to hail the day when the professed subjects of the gospel will place less confidence in swords and bayonets, and dare to commit themselves to truth and justice. And whenever it does arrive, as arrive we are convinced it will, then Christianity will appear before our industrious multitudes

in her beautiful garments; and their emancipation, wrought out by the activities of spiritual benevolence, like that of the poor negroes, will be followed by a reverential regard to religion which will prepare them to listen to its message, and bring them once again within the range of Divine truth.

Brief Notices.

The Neighbours: A Story of Every-Day Life. By Frederika Bremer.
Translated by Mary Howitt. 2 Vols. London: Longman.

LITTLE is known in this country of the social life of Sweden, and still less of its literature. Mr. Laing's volume has done somewhat to familiarize us with the former, and those now before us will be found to throw considerable light on both. The great charm of *The Neighbours* is the fresh and life-like picture which it furnishes of the domestic economy of Sweden. The scenes it unfolds, the characters it paints, the manners and habits it describes, are at once both original and obviously true to nature, while the sentiments expressed throughout the narrative, are at once amiable and pure, adapted to chasten the heart by rectifying its affections. Those who object to all fictitious narratives, will, of course, throw aside the work as unsuitable to their taste, but others, who commence its perusal, will be compelled to proceed with it throughout, and will possess at the close a more vivid and accurate view of Swedish character and Swedish life than could easily be obtained from any other source. The principal characters are well drawn and are nicely discriminated. Lars Andus and his 'little wife' Franziska, the very image of sprightliness, intelligence, and good feeling; Madame Mansfield, the step-mother of the former, with her proud bearing, and though bruised and shattered, yet thoroughly maternal heart; Bruno her son, like a thunder-cloud, dark and fearful; and Serena, an angel of light, who wins him back from crime and misery,—are all sketched with a masterly hand, and are made to act each his appropriate part in the evolution of the plot. The work here presented to the English reader is one of a series of four by the same author, of all of which Mrs. Howitt remarks—and if we may judge from the specimen before us, remarks truly—'They are most admirable in their lessons of social wisdom, in their life of relation, in their playful humour, and in all those qualities which can make writings acceptable to the fireside circle of the good and refined.' The translator informs us that the other three works, entitled, 'The House,' 'The President's Daughters,' and 'Nina,' are ready for publication, and will speedily follow 'The Neighbours,' if the patronage extended to the last be such as to warrant the undertaking. Of this we can entertain no doubt, as we have seldom met with a work which is more deserving, or more likely to secure the favour of a discerning public.

Damascus; or, Conversion in Relation to the Grace of God and the Agency of Man: an Essay. By David Everard Ford, author of 'Decapolis,' 'Chorazin,' &c. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

Christian Happiness Considered in its Relation to Man, Families, and Churches. By E. Mannering, Holywell Mount Chapel. London: Snow.

Both these little books are full of the spirit and sentiment of the gospel. Damascus is not inferior in adaptation for usefulness to any of Mr. Ford's previous essays. Such appeals, descriptions, and invitations as these books contain, cannot fail, under Divine blessing, to raise the standard of personal religion, and to bring souls to Christ. Their circulation amongst our families, churches, and in the world at large, would be an appropriate task of Christian benevolence.

Sabbath Evening Readings. By the Rev. Denis Kelly, M.A., Minister of Trinity Church, St. Bride's. London: Edwards, 12, Ave-Maria-Lane.

Sabbath Studies upon Life, Death, Incorporeal Existence, The Resurrection, Providence, and Prayer. By the author of 'A Synopsis of the Evidences of Christianity.' London: Macardy and Co. 1842.

Mr. Kelly's is a well-arranged, pleasing, and instructive manual for the use of the domestic circle on Sabbath evenings. It presents, in a series of interesting, simple, and brief expositions, many of the most important truths of scripture, and will be found profitable for religious reading. It is addressed to the mind and the heart. The other little book which we have coupled with it, because of similarity in its object, rather than in its style, is a pocket-volume of ninety pages. Its title is not appropriate, and it is deficient in originality and arrangement, but as a statement of religious truth may be useful.

A Course of Lectures on Infidelity. By Ministers of the Church of Scotland in Glasgow and Neighbourhood. Glasgow. Collins.

These lectures are intended as a supplement to some previously delivered and published on the Evidences of Revealed Religion. They exhibit those excellences and defects which usually distinguish the class of writings to which they belong. Our readers will, for the most part, understand what we mean, when we say that they are eminently Scotch, and besides, embody the thoughts and feelings of the Scottish Kirk. Their style and theology are strong and stern, and while attacking infidelity, the authors have mostly some few bugbears of their own, against which they carry on an intermittent and indirect warfare. These are, Arminianism, Sabbath Desecration, and Dissent; not one of which we anticipate will be destroyed by the stray shafts of the lecturers against infidelity. Amongst the productions of so many

minds, there must, of course, be various degrees of merit. Lecture 3, on the past history of infidelity, and lecture 7, containing an exposure of the unphilosophical and irreligious tenets of Socialism in a style of searching and severe irony, appeared to us especially interesting. We were amused with lecture 6, though we protest against many of the principles it advocates. It is a feeble attempt to brand those notions of civil and ecclesiastical liberty, which are generally entertained in the present day, with the name of infidelity, and concludes with a wail over the present condition of the kirk. In a book professedly catholic in its object, we greatly regret that such a lecture should have been introduced. The volume, from its intrinsic merits, as well as the high character of its authors, must command an extensive circulation.

Confessions of an Apostate. By the author of 'Felix de Lisle.'
London: Seeley and Burnside.

This little volume has the same design as the previous one, but is in a very different style and manner. It is a religious narrative, we suppose a fiction, illustrating the process by which the mind of many a youth may become gradually inveigled by the sophistries, and seduced by the poetry, of the Romish church. The subject of the narrative is represented as educated partly in Guernsey, thence proceeding to Oxford, embracing Puseyism, travelling in Normandy, converted to Popery, afterwards entering a catholic seminary in England with a view to the priesthood, and thence rescued by too severe a tyranny on the part of his religious superior. It abounds with elegant descriptions of natural beauty, and is similar in style to the author's previous volume, though scarcely prepared with equal care, or of such absorbing interest. Many well-selected quotations are found in it from the works of the tractarians. It is likely to be instructive and pleasing to a large class of readers.

Sabbath School Lectures on the Names, Titles, and Similitudes of the Lord Jesus Christ, in alphabetical order, with a Recommendatory Preface. By the Rev. J. Sherman. London: Ward.

The style of this publication, for the most part, is simple, and it is very likely to interest Sabbath-school children. The truths which it conveys are of the utmost importance. Some of the names and titles are perhaps fanciful, and not sufficiently justified by fair interpretation of the Bible. Of this kind are several taken from Solomon's Song. 'The Brazen Serpent' also is not a title of Christ, and the analogy recorded in John, iii. 14, depends, not on the object, but the action. We suppose that the lectures will be continued, as they have only reached the letter C. With Mr. Sherman we wish well to the undertaking, and commend these lectures to the attention of those who have charge of the religious education of children.

Christianity in the East. By the Rev. W. Buyers, Missionary of the London Society. London: Snow. 1842.

A discourse, according to the author, 'delivered before the directors of the London Missionary Society.' We dislike this phrase. It savours too much of the college exercise, or the royal sermon. The discourse itself abounds with useful information and practical hints, and we thank Mr. Buyers for its publication, as adapted to promote the great cause of Missions.

God's Hand in America. By the Rev. George B. Cheever. *With an Essay.* By the Rev. Dr. Skinner, New York. London: Wiley and Putnam. 1841.

An eloquent description of the moral and religious training, position, and responsibility of the American nation. It is replete with passages of great power and thrilling interest. It is printed in aid of a benevolent object, though what it is we are not informed. The introductory essay contains a sound exposition of the connexion between religion and patriotism. Altogether it is a book which will deeply interest readers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

The Rural and Domestic Life of Germany, with characteristic sketches of its Cities and Scenery. By William Howitt. 8vo.

Illustrations of Scripture from the Geography, Natural History, and Manners and Customs of the East. By the late Professor George Paxton, D.D. Third Edition, revised and greatly enlarged, by Rev. R. Jamieson. Geography, 12mo. Natural History, 12mo.

Progressive Questioning Book, comprising steps I. II. III., or Questions on Mark, Matthew, Luke, and the Acts, intended for the use of Teachers. By the Rev. E. T. M. Phillipps. 12mo.

A Practical Exposition of the Book of Jonah, in Ten Lectures. By James Peddie, D.D.

Use them; or, Gathered Fragments, Missionary Hints, and Anecdotes for the Young. By Mrs. Beddow. Second Edition.

Perseverance Rewarded: a Sequel to 'Use them; or, Gathered Fragments.' By Mrs. Beddow.

Correspondence of John, fourth Duke of Bedford, selected from the Originals at Woburn Abbey, with an Introduction by Lord John Russell. Vol. 1. 8vo.

The Intercommunity of Churches. A Sermon by the Rev. R. W. Hamilton. Published by request of the Congregational Union.

The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M., Principal of the University of Glasgow, 1637—1662, By David Laing, Esq. Volume 3.

On the Genealogies contained in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. By William Beeston, Esq. Third Edition.

The Pictorial History of Shakspeare. Part 50. The History of Opinion. Sermons by the late Rev. Ebenezer Temple, of Rochford, Essex, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author, by his Widow.

Geneveva, a Poem. By Richard Chevenir Trench.

The Poetical Treasury. A Series of Sacred Poems on Subjects selected from each chapter of Matthew and Mark. By Eliza Maskell.

The Nursery Rhymes of England, obtained principally from oral tradition. Collected and edited by James Orchard Halliwell, Esq. Second Edition.

Contribution towards the Exposition of the Book of Genesis. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D.

The Congregational Calendar and Family Almanac for 1843.

Russia and the Russians in 1842. By J. G. Kohl. Vol. II.

The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland illustrated. Part XIX.

Fox's Book of Martyrs. Edited by Rev. John Cumming, M.A. Part XVIII.

Canadian Scenery Illustrated. Part XXVIII.

Observations on the School Return for the diocese of Bath and Wells, showing the uncharitable Nature and Puseyite tendency of some of the questions contained therein. By Rev. Thomas Spencer, M.A.

The Great Physician: the connexion of Diseases and Remedies with the Truths of Revelation. By John Gardner, Surgeon.

The Eastern and Western States of America. By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. 3 vols.

Holy Songs and Musical Prayers, composed or adapted for four voices, with an accompaniment for the Pianoforte or Organ. By J. R. Ogden.

Hymns for the Christian Church and Home. Collected and edited by James Martineau.

The Vicar of Wakefield. By Oliver Goldsmith. With Thirty-two Illustrations by William Mulready, R.A. 8vo.

The Voice of Christ to the Churches, considered in a course of Twenty-one Lectures, expository and practical, on the Second and Third Chapters of the Book of the Revelation. By Ebenezer Miller, M.A.

Catholic and Evangelical Principles viewed in their application to the Church of God, in a series of letters to a friend. By Alfred Barrett.

Danger and Duty; or a Few Words on the present state of the times, and in behalf of righteousness, truth, and peace. By Rev. Richard Marks, Great Missenden.

The Charge of the Bishop of London examined, and its Unscriptural Tendency set forth. By one of the Laity.

Characteristics of Puseyism. A Sermon by Rev. H. J. Bevis. Published by request.

The Hall of Vision: a View of Principles. A Poem, in Three Books, with Minor Poems. By William Leask.

The Approaching Downfall of Popery and Civil Despotism in Europe. By a Layman.

A Private Journal kept during the Niger Expedition, from the commencement of May, 1841, till June, 1842. By William Simpson.

Sacred Lyrics. By Richard Hine, M.D.

Cottage Comforts, with hints for promoting them. Gleaned from Experience, and enlivened with Anecdotes. By Esther Copley. Seventeenth Edition, revised and enlarged.

Elements of Language and General Grammar. By George Payne, LL.D.

The Scottish Ecclesiastical Register and National Almanac for 1843.